

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 158 655

HE 010 351

TITLE Characteristics and Attitudes of the Financial Aid Administrator. (A Report on the Survey of the Profession in 1977.)

INSTITUTION National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 78

NOTE 201p.; Tables may be marginally legible

AVAILABLE FROM National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, 910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 217, Washington, D.C. 20006 (\$10.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Administrator Background; *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; Administrator Qualifications; Higher Education; Literature Reviews; *Management Development; *National Surveys; *Professional Recognition; Questionnaires; Research Projects; Salaries; Status; *Student Financial Aid; Tables (Data)

IDENTIFIERS *Professional Development

ABSTRACT

Data obtained from a survey of financial aid administrators in institutions of higher education, conducted to document the status of this rapidly expanding profession on a national basis, is organized into seven major sections. They include: (1) basic characteristics, such as age, sex, racial/ethnic background, and educational level; (2) salary levels; (3) attitudes on adequacy of salary, authority, status levels, etc.; (4) office characteristics, such as staff size and responsibility for student employment; (5) external contacts with the U.S. Office of Education, Congress, or state agencies; (6) professional development, discussed in terms of compensation for conferences, course work, or membership in professional association; and (7) research activities. Responses to the survey are presented in bivariate format using the Crosstabs computer system, with each table including the number of respondents and percentages. Each series of tables is accompanied by a narrative that highlights some of the findings. The first appendix reports the salaries of financial aid directors by institutional type, control, size, and geographic area. The second and third appendices contain copies of the 1974 and 1977 survey questionnaires. A brief review of earlier research is included in the preface. (JMD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES OF THE FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATOR

OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS FOR THIS
SYSTEM ARE ON MICROFICHE ONLY
FOR ACCESS OF ALL USERS

WASFAA

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN IS
UNCLASSIFIED, EXCEPT WHERE SHOWN
OTHERWISE, AND IS AVAILABLE TO ALL
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEMS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

CHARACTERISTICS AND ATTITUDES
OF THE
FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATOR
(A Report on the Survey of the Profession in 1977)

National Association of Student
Financial Aid Administrators
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

NASFAA is a non-profit corporation of institutions of postsecondary education and other individuals, agencies and students who are interested in promoting the effective administration of student financial aid in the United States. The results of this survey are intended to help the general public better understand the characteristics and attitudes of those individuals who are directly responsible for administering student aid funds and to focus upon those areas where additional attention needs to be directed to upgrade the profession.

This objective analysis, coupled with future action designed to improve current deficiencies, will lead to an improved and more efficient system of administering student financial aid services.

Copies of this survey may be ordered from the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, 910 17th Street, N.W., Suite 217, Washington, D.C. 20006. The price is \$10.00 per copy, and payment must accompany orders.

Editorial or copyright inquiries concerning this publication should be directed to the Executive Director of NASFAA at the above address.

Copyright © 1978 by NASFAA
All Rights Reserved
Printed in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table Number(s)		Page(s)
	Preface	v-xiv
	Acknowledgements	xv
	Organization of the Report	xvii-xviii
	 <u>Section A - Basic Characteristics of Student Financial Aid Administrators.....</u>	 1
1-1, 1-2	Institutional Size, Control, Type.....	3- 4
1-3	Age.....	5
1-4 to 1-7	Sex.....	6- 7
1-8 to 1-11	Racial/Ethnic.....	8-10
1-12 to 1-14	NASFAA Membership.....	11-12
1-15	Employment Status (Full-Time, Part-Time)....	13
1-16	Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid.....	14
1-17	Other Area of Responsibility.....	15
1-18 to 1-20	Years of Employment in Financial Aid.....	16-17
1-21	Educational Level.....	18
1-22	Geographic Location.....	19
1-23, 1-24	Academic Level of Students Served.....	20-21
1-25 to 1-27	Central or Non-Central Office.....	22-23
1-28 to 1-32	Tenure.....	24-26
	 <u>Section B - Salaries of Student Financial Aid Administrators.....</u>	 27
2-1 to 2-9	Salaries.....	29-38
	 <u>Section C - Attitudes.....</u>	 39
	<u>Salary.....</u>	41
3-1 to 3-10	Adequacy of Salary Compared to Outside of Respondents' Institution.....	41-46
3-11 to 3-20	Adequacy of Salary Within Respondents' Institution.....	47-52
	<u>Job-Related Characteristics.....</u>	53
4-1 to 4-4	Enough Authority to do Job Effectively.....	53-55
4-5 to 4-7	Superiors Have Clear Idea of Job Being Done by Respondent.....	56-58

Table Number(s)		Page(s)
4-8 to 4-11	Recognized as Holding an Important Position.....	59- 61
4-12 to 4-16	Financial Aid as a Career.....	62- 64
	<u>Communications and Training</u>	65
5-1 to 5-3	Adequacy of Communications.....	65- 66
5-4 to 5-8	Adequacy of Training.....	67- 69
	<u>Federal Programs</u>	70
6-1 to 6-3	Interfund Transfers (Campus-Based Programs).....	70- 71
6-4 to 6-6	Administrative Allowance (GSL, BEOG).....	72- 73
6-7 to 6-8	Revision of Tri-Partite Application Process.....	74- 75
6-9 to 6-11	Adequacy of the Regional Panel Process.....	76- 77
6-12 to 6-14	Need for Periodic Federal Program Reviews..	78- 79
6-15 to 6-17	Received Good Support from the Regional Office of Education.....	80- 81
	<u>Miscellaneous</u>	82
7-1 to 7-4	Aid for Full-Time and Half-Time Students...	82- 84
7-5 to 7-8	Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs....	85- 87
7-9 to 7-14	Certification of Aid Administrators.....	88- 91
	<u>Section D - Office Characteristics</u>	93
	<u>Staffing</u>	95
8-1 to 8-13	Staff Size and Adequacy of Staff.....	95-102
	<u>Immediate Supervisor</u>	103
9-1 to 9-3	Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid.....	103-105
	<u>Student Employment Responsibilities</u>	106
10-1 to 10-3	Office Responsibility for Student Employment.....	106-107
	<u>Need-Based Awards</u>	108
11-1 to 11-3	Percentage of Awards Based on Computed Need.....	108-109
	<u>Section E - External Contacts</u>	111
12-1 to 12-6	External Contacts (USOE, Congress, State Agencies, etc.).....	113-118

	<u>Section F - Professional Development.....</u>	119
13-1 to 13-5	Major Conference Preferred.....	121-123
13-6 to 13-9	Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings.....	124-125
13-10	Release Time for Instate Meetings.....	126
13-11 to 13-15	Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings....	127-129
13-16	Paid Release Time for Out-of-State Meetings	130
13-17 to 13-19	Expenses Paid for Workshops.....	131-132
13-20	Paid Release Time for Workshops.....	133
13-21 to 13-25	Expenses Paid for Course Work.....	134-136
13-26	Paid Release Time for Course Work.....	137
13-27, 13-28	Office Subscriptions.....	138
13-29 to 13-40	Institutional Willingness to Pay for Individual Memberships in State, Regional, National Associations.....	139-143
	<u>Section G - Research Activities.....</u>	145
14-1 to 14-15	Recent Financial Aid Research Projects.....	147-154
	<u>Appendix A - Financial Aid Directors'</u> <u>Salaries by Institutional Type, Control,</u> <u>and Size and by Geographic Area.....</u>	155-167
	<u>Appendix B - 1974 Survey Questionnaire</u>	169
	<u>Appendix C - 1977 Survey Questionnaire</u>	177

Preface

Beginning in 1972, federal expenditures for student aid began to increase significantly and the role of the institutional aid administrator became even more important than it had been in the past. In spite of the vital role that these administrators were performing, comprehensive data on a national basis about their professional skills and attitudes had not been compiled. Therefore, the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators in 1974 commissioned William J. Bushaw, of the University of Iowa, to conduct a national survey to determine the function, education, status, and other relevant information about this rapidly expanding profession. In preparing this first national survey, Mr. Bushaw reviewed previous studies which had been conducted on a limited scale to determine what changes had occurred in the profession during the past few years.

Earlier Studies about the Profession

The first of these studies which Bushaw reviewed was the study conducted by George Nash and Paul F. Lazarsfeld in 1968 entitled, "New Administrator on Campus: A Study of the Director of Financial Aid." From their study a great deal of useful information was gathered concerning the work and characteristics of aid administrators at senior institutions. A year later in 1969 James B. Puryear presented a study which essentially repeated the work of Nash and Lazarsfeld, entitled, "Two-Year College Financial Aid Officers." The population for this survey was taken from a sample of two-year colleges, and the results were generally similar, except that the two-year administrator was slightly older and tended to have a smaller supporting staff than did the administrator from the four-year school. The Puryear study was reported in the Journal of College Student Personnel, January 1974.

In 1970, Warren N. Willingham surveyed the financial aid administrators' present level of professional development. Using a representative sample of 122 institutions in the West, Willingham, for the first time, included questions dealing with training needs and attitudes concerning future development of the profession. Among the major findings were (1) the annual turnover rate was somewhat lower and inter-institutional hiring somewhat higher than before; (2) workshops were the favored method of maintaining professional competence; and (3) one-third of the aid administrators could be classified at a low level of professional development in the sense that they were involved in few professional activities. The Willingham study, "Professional Development of Financial Aid Officers: Higher Education Surveys Report No. 2," was published by the College Entrance Examination Board in November 1970.

Clarence L. Casazza completed still another study in 1970, entitled, "Career Patterns of Financial Aid Directors," which was reported

in the Journal of Student Financial Aid in November 1971. Casazza studied career patterns of financial aid directors at 179 institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more and received usable responses from 73% of his sample. Data obtained from the survey showed (1) the Master's degree was the typical degree for financial aid directors; (2) there appeared to be a definite relationship between institutional attendance and employment; (3) financial aid directors came to their positions from a wide range of work experiences; and (4) the typical aid director held his position between two and five years.

In 1972 Wayne O. Chambers conducted "A Survey of the Professional Development of Student Financial Aid Administrators in Nine Southern States." Using an adaptation of the Willingham questionnaire, Chambers surveyed student financial aid administrators in nine southern states which comprise the Southern Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. The population surveyed included 600 institutions of postsecondary education and, of that number, 388 provided usable returns. Some of the major findings were (1) about half of the respondents had three or more years' experience in financial aid; (2) 60% rated medium to high on professional development; (3) the median age was 37.3 years; (4) two-thirds had at least a Master's degree; and (5) professional meetings and workshops were the two most favored methods of maintaining professional competence.

Also patterning his research design after the Willingham study, Ronald J. Schiesz in 1973 surveyed the professional characteristics of financial aid directors at colleges and universities throughout Illinois. The population was comprised of 128 Illinois student financial aid administrators with a usable response of 92 questionnaires. This data revealed that the Illinois aid administrators were then slightly older, had been in the position longer, were more mobile, and were more likely than previously to have a Master's degree. The Schiesz study reported in the March 1974 issue of the Journal of Student Financial Aid was entitled, "A Study of Certain Professional Characteristics of Financial Aid Administrators at Institutions of Higher Education in the State of Illinois."

The review of these earlier studies emphasized the need for a national survey and, therefore, at the direction of NASFAA's National Council, a questionnaire was developed and mailed in late March 1974 to 3,643 directors of financial aid at institutions of postsecondary education which participated in the Office of Education sponsored programs of student assistance. (A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix B.) Responses were received from 1,954 individuals for a 54% return rate.

Major Findings and Conclusions of the 1974 Survey

The data obtained from 1,954 financial aid directors in the 1974 survey provided insight into (1) background characteristics; (2) professional characteristics; (3) academic background; (4) job orientation; (5) maintenance of professional competence; (6) degree of professionalization; (7) needed professional development; and (8) characteristics of the aid administrator. With this information, Bushaw was able to

develop a "national" description of the financial aid administrator. His major findings and conclusions are reported by the above-listed eight areas of emphasis.

1. Background Characteristics

The typical financial aid director was a male Caucasian between the ages of 36 and 40 years.

Although nearly three out of four financial aid directors were male, the percentage of female financial aid directors was increasing in 1974. Additionally, women were most likely to be employed by a private four-year institution.

One out of ten financial aid directors was a member of a minority group. Two-year institutions afforded the greatest percentage of employment opportunities for minority financial aid directors, followed by private institutions.

The average age of financial aid directors fell within the 36-40 year age range, which is consistent with earlier studies. Although financial aid directors in two-year institutions were slightly younger on the average, the gap was narrowing from earlier studies. There was, however, a gradual drop in the number of financial aid directors past their mid-forties who were working at two-year institutions.

2. Professional Characteristics

In nearly two out of three instances, financial aid directors devoted full time to their positions. If the position remained part-time, the employer normally was a two-year, a private graduate/professional, or a proprietary institution.

The typical director had worked in financial aid approximately the same amount of time as he had been director. Although still low, those reporting experience in financial aid prior to assuming the director's position were increasing.

Employment in postsecondary education provided a career path into financial aid. With the exception of proprietary institutions, private business was furnishing fewer financial aid directors than it had previously.

In 1974 the annual turnover rate was decreasing. In just 3% of the cases, the financial aid director had less than one year's experience. Only financial aid directors at proprietary and public graduate/professional institutions exceeded the previous rate of 20%. On the other hand, nearly seven of every ten financial aid directors had three or more years' experience. In fact, the number having worked in financial aid five years or longer approached 50%.

Directors' salaries had advanced to the \$12,000-\$13,999 range in 1974, but were not keeping pace with inflation. Financial aid directors at two-year and public four-year-and-beyond institutions had the highest average salaries. Women typically received lower salaries than men.

This difference, however, was tempered by the fact that a larger percentage of the women was employed by two- and four-year private institutions, which had the lowest average compensation for all financial aid directors.

3. Academic Background

Approximately one-fifth of the financial aid directors had degrees from their employing institutions. If the director held a degree from an employing institution, it was usually the undergraduate degree and the institution was a private one.

The Master's degree, if not a formal requirement for a financial aid director, was an informal one. Of those responding, over 60% had a Master's or higher degree. A financial aid director with a Doctorate remained a rarity.

If the financial aid director was pursuing a degree, it was usually the Master's followed by the Doctorate. For those planning degree work, the Doctorate was the choice most often selected.

There was considerable difference between the academic courses thought "Useful" and the ones the financial aid directors had taken themselves. Of those courses listed in the 1974 survey, only counseling had been taken by a majority of financial aid directors.

4. Job Orientation

As in previous studies, there was a wide difference between the courses thought "useful" in orienting new financial aid administrators and those "I had" upon becoming a financial aid administrator.

Although not ranked as high in previous studies, the internship method was still the most desirable way of obtaining practical experience. However, only a few financial aid directors had ever had the opportunity for such an experience. As far as actually receiving practical experience, on-the-job training was overwhelmingly rated the way most financial aid directors had obtained practical experience. In addition, on-the-job training, although ranked behind the internship method, received increased favor over previous studies as the best way for new financial aid administrators to obtain practical experience.

Financial aid directors, when asked to express a preference for workshop topics for either new and/or experienced financial aid administrators, advocated topics dealing with "practical," "immediate," and "survival" type skills and information.

5. Maintaining Professional Competence

Attending professional meetings, participating in workshops, reading professional periodicals, and meeting periodically with Regional Office of Education officials were all favored ways financial aid directors preferred to keep current in 1974. Coursework and summer institutes were the least favored ways of maintaining professional competence.

It was interesting that the closer the professional meeting was to the director's home base, the greater its importance was as a preferred way to keep current. Furthermore, respondents favored methods of keeping current which were direct, to the point, and could be covered in a relatively short period of time.

The financial aid director was likely to belong to both a state and a regional financial aid association and institutions were likely to contribute toward the director maintaining professional competence by providing released time and paying expenses to attend financial aid meetings and workshops. Institutions also usually paid for office subscriptions and memberships in financial aid associations.

6. Degree of Professionalism

Although the majority of the financial aid directors belonged to professional associations, it was disappointing that the percentage was not higher. There was room for further improvement, especially at the regional level.

Financial aid directors were somewhat involved in professional activities and kept well informed on matters of current importance in financial aid. However, as the degree of active involvement increased, there was a marked drop in participation. Publishing continued to rank extremely low in the hierarchy of activities, but this low rating did not appear to reflect a lesser regard for publishing by the financial aid director. Rather, it appeared to reflect that there was little provision made or reward given for publishing.

7. Needed Professional Development

All of the possibilities listed in the 1974 questionnaire were thought to have importance in further development of the profession. Immediate training for new financial aid administrators received the greatest support, followed by providing opportunities for professional growth to those in smaller aid operations and for developing self-study materials for new financial aid administrators. The establishment of graduate programs in financial aid, although important, had the least amount of support.

8. Characteristics of the Aid Office

According to the 1974 survey, the financial aid director held a position of esteem within the institution's administrative hierarchy. Although there was a variety of organizational possibilities, the director usually reported to the vice-president for student services, and consequently, reported through no more than one person to reach the president. When the financial aid director did not report to the vice-president for student services, the most common practice was for him/her to report directly to the president.

Financial aid directors were responsible for administering a large number of highly complex programs, each with separate requirements and guidelines. In addition, they participated in a variety of activities,

both within and outside the institution. Although the financial aid director's position had a great deal of responsibility, the institution typically filled the position with someone of less experience than the director felt was necessary, and provided him with inadequate staff support. When added staff support was provided, it was usually at the clerical level. Consequently, out of necessity, many clerical employees were functioning as para-professionals, resulting in a whole new set of educational and training needs for this type employee.

The results of the 1974 survey were not distributed to the participants because of limited financial resources, but data from this study was used during the next two years by NASFAA in shaping its programs and policy positions.

In 1977, the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (MASFAA) published a comprehensive study of student aid administrators in the midwest. The study was conducted by the MASFAA Research Committee, which in 1976-77 was chaired by Harvey P. Grotrian.

Following a review of the MASFAA study, the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators decided that a similar study should be conducted on a nationwide basis. Accordingly, NASFAA established a "Survey of the Profession Committee," consisting of the following three members: Dr. Robert B. Holmes, Office of Financial Aid, The University of Michigan; Mr. Harvey P. Grotrian, Office of Financial Aid, The University of Michigan; Ms. Karen Dickinson, Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.

Building from the 1974 survey and the MASFAA survey, it was decided that the 1977 survey would focus on such areas as salaries, attitudes, office characteristics, sources of information, and professional development.

A total of 3,450 questionnaires were mailed to financial aid administrators employed by educational institutions. (A copy of this questionnaire is included in Appendix C.) A total of 2,775 of the questionnaires were mailed in late August 1977 to individuals holding NASFAA membership. An additional mailing to 675 individuals employed in offices serving graduate/professional students was made from a separate mailing list in October 1977. Follow-up postcards were sent to both groups to remind them to return the questionnaire.

A total of 1,912 questionnaires were returned by mid-January 1978. Due to the duplication between the two mailing lists used for the survey, it is estimated that 61.0% of the unduplicated number of individuals receiving the questionnaire returned it by mid-January 1978.

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, the 1977 survey was designed so that all replies were treated with the strictest confidence, and it was not possible to connect anyone with his or her responses. However, since it was not possible to identify respondents,

it was also not possible to identify non-respondents. Therefore, the survey results are only applicable to the respondents and should not be generalized, or at least should be very carefully generalized, to the larger population of financial aid administrators.

The data obtained from the 1,912 respondents in the 1977 survey provided insight into (1) background characteristics; (2) salary levels; (3) attitudes and opinions; (4) office characteristics; (5) external contacts; (6) professional development; and (7) research activities.

The major findings and conclusions of the 1977 survey are reported by the above-listed seven areas of emphasis.

Major Findings and Conclusions of the 1977 Survey

1. Background Characteristics

The typical financial aid director in 1977 was a male Caucasian, 38 years of age, employed full-time. Even though 67% of financial aid directors were male, the percentage of female financial aid directors had increased by 9% since the 1974 survey. In addition, female administrators were more likely to be employed in the proprietary sector (52%), followed by the independent sector (43%).

One out of ten financial aid directors was a member of a minority group. With the exception of Spanish surnamed administrators, minority administrators (Blacks, Native Americans, and Orientals) had a greater tendency to be women than did white respondents and were more likely to be employed at public institutions.

The median age of directors remained stable at 38. Associate/assistant directors had a median age of 33, while the median age for counselors was 34.

Aproximately half of the aid administrators had worked in financial aid six years or more with 3% reporting 16 years or more experience. 13% of the directors had one year or less experience.

As in earlier studies, the financial aid director with a Doctorate degree remained a rarity (6%), while 52% of the directors had a Master's degree.

2. Salary Levels

Institutional control and size are primary determinants of salary level. For example, directors' salaries were significantly higher at public institutions (\$19,050) followed by \$14,430 at independent institutions and \$12,620 at proprietary institutions.

3. Attitudes and Opinions

The need for increased authority for interfund transfers received overwhelming support from all varieties of institutional type, control, and size.

Over 81% of the respondents agreed that receipt of a federal administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility by their institution for the BEOG and GSL programs.

Dissatisfaction with the current Tri-Partite Application process and panel review procedures was evident. 80% of the respondents agreed that the Tri-Partite process should be changed to depend more upon verifiable, historical data and only 50% of the respondents agreed that the panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions.

The need for periodic program reviews by the U.S. Office of Education was underscored by the fact that over 90% of the respondents agreed that they were necessary.

Over 85% of the respondents agreed that their institutions had received good support from their Regional Office of Education.

A total of 85% of the respondents disagreed that there had "been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs" at their institution.

4. Office Characteristics

The results of the 1977 survey reveal that the majority of the directors think they have enough authority to do their job effectively. In addition, they feel they are recognized by others in their institution as holding an important position and agree that financial aid is sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career.

As in an earlier survey, the majority of directors in public and private institutions reported to a chief administrator for student activities. Directors at proprietary institutions were more likely to report directly to the president than were directors at other types of institutions.

5. External Contacts

Slightly over half of the respondents indicated that they had not contacted the office of a member of the U.S. Congress regarding a financial aid problem or issue during the last year. Contact with federal officials is more frequent with approximately 75% of the respondents reporting that they had contacted a DHEW/USOE official in Washington during the past year. An even higher frequency of contact (88%) was reported with regional officials. In addition, approximately one-fourth of the respondents had written or called the NASFAA office in the past year.

6. Professional Development

Professional financial aid training programs were judged to be adequate by over 84% of the respondents. However, respondents with doctorate degrees were twice as likely to find training inadequate, as were respondents holding other degrees. Another group of respondents

finding training programs inadequate was employed in offices serving graduate/ professional students. Respondents from the rocky mountain region were most satisfied with training programs, while the respondents from the western region were the most dissatisfied.

If respondents were able to attend only one major conference per year, approximately equal numbers would attend either their regional conference (39%) or their state conference (42%). Directors from public institutions were almost twice as likely to express a preference for attending the NASFAA annual conference as were directors from independent institutions.

Over 95% of the respondents reported that their institutions were willing to pay the expenses for their attendance at instate meetings, and expenses for out of state meetings would be paid for 83% of the respondents. Institutions also usually pay for office subscriptions and memberships in financial aid associations.

Over 85% of the respondents agreed that communications from NASFAA and regional associations were adequate to keep them informed about current issues in financial aid.

7. Research Activities

Just over 30% of the directors of financial aid responding to the 1977 survey reported that their office had conducted research on topics related to financial aid within the past two years. Respondents from large institutions were more than twice as likely to conduct research projects than were respondents from small schools. Of the directors conducting research projects, the impact of financial aid programs was addressed in over one-half of the projects. The results of the research were primarily used for financial aid office operations and policy making.

While a comparison of the 1974 and 1977 surveys is not possible because of the differences in the items contained in the two respective questionnaires, there are numerous data elements which are compatible. The chart on the following page lists these elements and shows the percentage of respondents in each category:

	1974	1977
Institutional Control		
Independent	49%	50%
Public	46%	42%
Proprietary	5%	8%
Median Age	36-40	38
Sex		
Male	76%	67%
Female	24%	33%
Ethnic Origin		
Black	7%	6%
Native American	1%	0.05%
Oriental	0	0.05%
Spanish Sur-Named	2%	2%
White	90%	89%
Other	0	2%
Level of Education		
High School Diploma or Other	5%	11%
Associate	5%	4%
Bachelors	28%	27%
Masters	58%	52%
Doctorate	4%	6%
Years of Employment in the Student Financial Aid Profession		
1 year or less	13%	14%
4 years or more	44%	68%
16 years or more	2%	3%
Median Salary Levels by Type of Institution		
All Types	\$13,000	\$16,250
Public	15,000	19,050
Independent	11,600	14,430
Proprietary	11,000	12,620

As the number of individuals employed in the financial aid profession continues to grow, and as the administration of financial aid programs becomes more complex, it is essential that future studies on the characteristics and attitudes of aid administrators be continued. While the tables presented in this survey represent only a few of the many combinations that could be presented, it is hoped that they will answer many questions and help to define other issues that should be addressed in the future. It is also hoped that the results will underline the importance and critical needs of the total financial aid profession.

Editors

Joyce Dunagan, Assistant Director, NASFAA
Dallas Martin, Executive Director, NASFAA

-xiv-

Acknowledgements

When NASFAA decided to conduct the initial survey in 1974, as well as the second survey in 1977, a primary goal was to document the "Status of the Profession" on a national basis in hopes of improving the overall administration and support for student financial aid services at all postsecondary educational institutions. From the beginning it was decided that the identification of critical literature and the collection of accurate information would be dependent upon the cooperation of many people. That assumption proved to be very true since literally hundreds of our financial aid colleagues contributed to this effort. There are however, several individuals who should be recognition by NASFAA for their special efforts. In particular, special recognition is given to William J. Bushaw for compiling the first survey. In addition, special thanks also is given to the following individuals for their help with the first survey. They include Dr. William Snider, from the University of Iowa, who helped develop the computer programs; Dr. James Maxey, from the American College Testing Program, for advice on constructing the tables; and Dr. Al Hood, University of Iowa for overseeing the study.

A special recognition also is given to Robert B. Holmes, Harvey P. Grotrian, and Karen Dickinson, all of the University of Michigan for designing, conducting, and compiling the second survey.

In addition, a special thank you also is given to Ms. Carol W. Van Dyke and Ms. Diane L. McCallum, who are members of the administrative staff at the University of Michigan, for their assistance in preparing this report.

Organization of the Report

The data in this report is organized into seven major sections which include:

1. Basic Characteristics
2. Salary
3. Attitudes
4. Office Characteristics
5. External Contacts
6. Professional Development
7. Research Activities

Each section is identified separately in the Table of Contents for ease in reference. The responses to the questions are presented in a bivariate format using the Crosstabs computer system. Each table includes the number of respondents falling into each category, as well as row and column percentages. For example, in the table shown below, it can be seen that respondents' titles and regions are being compared.

ROWS = TITLE		REGIONAL COLUMNS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES					
	EASFAA	SASFAA	MASFAA	SWASFAA	PMASFAA	WASFAA	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	392 28.447 74.102	221 16.038 76.207	397 28.810 70.766	139 10.087 81.287	75 5.443 85.227	154 11.176 66.074	1378 100.000 73.611
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.	46 28.395 8.696	17 10.494 5.862	64 32.506 11.408	10 6.173 5.048	4 2.469 4.545	21 12.963 9.013	162 100.000 8.654
FIN.AID/ OFFICER/ COUN/AD	55 29.730 10.397	28 15.135 9.655	52 28.108 9.269	10 5.405 5.848	4 2.162 4.545	36 19.459 15.451	185 100.000 9.882
OTHER	36 24.490 6.805	24 16.327 8.276	40 32.653 8.556	12 0.163 7.018	5 3.401 5.682	22 14.966 9.442	147 100.000 7.853
COLUMN SUMS	529 28.259 100.000	290 15.491 100.000	561 29.968 100.000	171 9.135 100.000	88 4.701 100.000	233 12.447 100.000	1872 100.000

A total of 1,872 individuals responded to both questions. There were 392 directors from EASFAA states who responded. Directors of financial aid from EASFAA states comprised 28.447% of the total number of directors responding to the survey (1,378). In addition, the directors from EASFAA states represented 74.102% of the 529 respondents from EASFAA states. In the aggregate, directors of financial aid represented 73.611% of the respondents, while EASFAA respondents comprised 28.259% of all respondents.

The total number of respondents varies slightly from one table to another due to some questions not being answered or due to unusable responses. In some cases, however, the number of respondents varies since the table only includes selected categories. For example, in order to permit the comparison of salaries among a homogeneous group,

salary tables only include individuals who are employed full-time and who devote at least 50% of their employment time to financial aid.

Each series of tables is accompanied by a narrative which highlights some of the findings. In some cases, the chi-square test of statistical significance is employed.

Section A

Basic Characteristics of
Student Financial
Aid Administrators

TABLE 1-1 Institutional Size by Institutional Control

TABLE 1-2 Institutional Size by Institutional Type

Almost half (49.6%) of the respondents to the survey were employed at independent institutions and just over 42 percent were employed at public institutions. Eight percent of the respondents were from proprietary schools.

Approximately 63 percent of the respondents from public institutions were employed by institutions with enrollments of over 4,000 students as compared to less than one-fourth of those from independent institutions and less than 2 percent of those from proprietary institutions.

Respondents were employed in a wide range of institutional types. The largest group was employed in 4-year institutions which offered advanced degree work (36.9%). Slightly over two-thirds of this group were from institutions with enrollments of over 4,000. The next largest group was 4-year institutions with the majority (88.6%) of these having enrollments of under 4,000. Nursing schools had both the smallest number of respondents (40) and the smallest institutional size (all were under 1,000).

TABLE 1-1 Institutional Size by Control

INSTITUTIONAL ROWS - CLASSIFICATION		INSTITUTIONAL COLUMNS - SIZE				
		UNDER 1000	1000- 3999	4000- 9999	10,000- 19,999	20,000+ POW SUMS
PUBLIC		78	211	196	158	643
		9.738	26.342	24.469	19.725	100.000
		12.704	37.882	63.430	67.214	181.230
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)		408	325	112	75	918
		43.497	34.648	11.940	7.996	100.000
		66.450	58.348	36.246	31.915	187.959
PROPRI- ETARY		128	21	1	2	152
		84.211	13.816	0.658	1.316	100.000
		20.847	3.770	0.324	0.851	25.992
COLUMN SUMS		614	557	309	235	1716
		32.479	29.455	16.341	12.427	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-2 Institutional Size by Type

INSTITUTIONAL						INSTITUTIONAL	
ROWS = TYPE						COLUMNS = SIZE	
	UNDER 1000	1000- 3999	4000- 9999	10,000- 19,999	20,000+	ROW SUMS	
VOC.	114	28	11	9	2	166	
TECH.	68.675	16.867	7.831	5.422	1.205	100.000	
	19.128	5.176	4.276	3.913	1.143	8.992	
2 YEARS	114	120	69	39	16	358	
3 UNDER	11.344	33.520	19.274	10.894	4.469	100.000	
NOT V.T.	19.128	22.181	22.697	16.957	9.143	19.393	
4 YEAR	194	209	24	20	8	455	
	42.637	45.914	5.275	4.396	1.758	100.000	
	12.550	38.632	7.895	8.696	4.571	24.648	
4 YEAR	50	162	19	14	135	681	
AND	7.342	21.789	28.047	20.999	19.824	100.000	
BEYOND	4.183	29.945	62.829	62.174	77.143	36.891	
GRADING	40					40	
	100.000					100.000	
	6.711					2.167	
GRADZ	84	22	7	19	14	146	
PROFE.	57.534	15.068	4.795	11.014	9.589	100.000	
ONLY	14.094	4.067	2.103	8.261	8.000	7.909	
COLLEGE	596	541	304	230	175	1846	
SUMS	12.286	29.167	16.468	12.459	9.480	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

TABLE 1-3 Age of Student Financial Aid Administrators by Title

Almost 75 percent of the respondents to the survey were Directors of Financial Aid. Less than 10 percent of the respondents fell into each of the remaining 3 categories of "Associate/Assistant Director," "Financial Aid Officer/Counselor/Advisor," or "Other." The "other" category included a wide variety of respondents including the following job titles:

1. Coordinator of Financial Aid
2. Coordinator of Student Services
3. Dean of Student Services
4. Acting Director of Financial Aid
5. Registrar and Director of Financial Aid

The median age of Directors was approximately 38. Associate/Assistant Directors had a median age of 33, while the median age for Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors was 34.

Table 1-3 Age by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = AGE

	UNDER 25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-50	51-59	60+	ROW SUMS
DIRFC- TOR	73 5.229 58.871	256 18.338 66.841	274 19.628 74.863	218 15.616 78.700	288 20.630 76.190	223 15.974 78.799	64 4.585 75.294	1396 100.000 73.629
ASSOC./ DIRECT.	17 10.180 13.710	51 30.539 13.316	38 22.754 10.383	16 9.581 5.776	22 13.174 5.820	18 10.778 6.360	5 2.994 5.882	167 100.000 8.808
FIN.AID/ OFFICER/ COUN/AD	22 11.828 17.742	53 28.495 13.838	27 14.516 7.377	18 9.677 6.498	36 19.355 9.524	20 10.753 7.067	10 5.376 11.765	186 100.000 9.810
OTHER	12 8.163 9.677	23 15.646 6.005	27 18.167 7.377	25 17.007 9.025	32 21.769 8.466	22 14.966 7.774	6 4.082 7.059	147 100.000 7.753
COLUMN SUMS	124 6.540 100.000	303 29.200 100.000	366 19.104 100.000	277 14.610 100.000	378 19.917 100.000	283 14.926 100.000	85 4.483 100.000	1896 100.000

TABLES 1-4 Through 1-7 Sex of Student Financial Aid Administrators

Almost 63 percent of the respondents were men, while 37 percent were women. The majority of the respondents in 3 of the title categories were men, with women comprising 56.7 percent of the "Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors" category (Table 1-4). 78.3 percent of the men responding to the survey were Directors, as opposed to 65.5 percent of the women.

As seen in Table 1-5, women respondents tended to be younger than men, with the median age of women being 35 as opposed to 38 for men (significant at the .01 level). 35.2 percent of the women were 30 or under, while 21.7 percent of the men were in this age category. There were also significant differences (at the .01 level) between men and women based on their place of employment. For example, women responding to the survey were less likely than men to be employed in public institutions and more likely than men (42.7% vs. 26.6%) to be employed in institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (Tables 1-6 and 1-7).

Table 1-4 Sex by Title

ROWS - TITLE COLUMNS - SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	736	462	1192
	66.810	33.190	100.000
	78.283	65.625	73.573
ASSOCIATE	98	69	167
ASSIST.	58.683	41.317	100.000
DIRECT.	8.249	9.801	18.050
FIN.AID	81	106	187
OFFICER	43.316	56.684	100.000
COUN/AD	6.818	15.057	21.875
OTHER	79	67	146
	54.110	45.890	100.000
	6.650	9.517	16.167
COLUMNS	1184	704	1888
SUMS	62.791	37.209	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-5 Sex by Age

ROWS = AGE

COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	58	66	124
	46.774	53.226	100.000
	4.878	9.375	6.550
26-30	200	182	382
	52.356	47.644	100.000
	16.821	25.852	20.180
31-35	259	107	366
	70.765	29.235	100.000
	21.783	15.199	19.334
36-40	202	75	277
	72.924	27.076	100.000
	16.989	10.653	14.633
41-50	247	129	376
	65.691	34.309	100.000
	20.774	18.324	19.863
51-59	171	111	282
	60.638	39.362	100.000
	14.382	15.767	14.897
60+	52	34	86
	60.465	39.535	100.000
	4.373	4.830	4.543
COL SUMS	1189	704	1893
	62.810	37.190	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-6 Sex by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION

COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	578	223	801
	72.160	27.840	100.000
	44.694	31.766	42.403
INDEP.	537	401	938
(PRI-	57.249	42.751	100.000
VATE)	45.240	57.123	49.656
PROPRI-	72	78	150
ETARY	48.000	52.000	100.000
	6.066	11.111	7.941
COLUMN SUMS	1187	702	1889
	62.837	37.163	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-7 Sex by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FEMALE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 100	315	299	614
	51.303	48.697	100.000
	26.560	42.653	32.538
100-399	365	191	556
	65.647	34.353	100.000
	30.776	27.247	29.465
400-999	224	83	307
	72.964	27.036	100.000
	18.887	11.840	16.269
10,000-19,999	162	73	235
	68.936	31.064	100.000
	13.659	10.414	12.454
20,000+	120	55	175
	68.571	31.429	100.000
	10.118	7.846	9.274
COLUMN SUMS	1186	701	1887
	62.851	37.149	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-8 Through 1-11 Racial/Ethnic Background of Student
Financial Aid Administrators

Approximately 10 percent of the respondents were minorities. The Black respondents, totaling 132, represented 6.9 percent of the total number completing the questionnaire.

Two-thirds of the respondents in each racial/ethnic category (with the exception of Oriental) were Directors. Minorities were more likely than whites to be in the categories of "Associate/Assistant Director" and "Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors." For example, 8.9 percent of the whites were Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors, while 18.2 percent of the Blacks fell into this category (Table 1-8).

As seen in Table 1-9, minority respondents tended to be slightly younger than did majority respondents. For example, whites had a median age of approximately 38, while minorities (Blacks, Native Americans, Orientals, and Spanish Surnamed) had a median age of approximately 33.

Table 1-10 highlights the relationship between the race and sex of respondents. With the exception of Spanish Surnamed respondents, minority respondents (Blacks, Native Americans, and Orientals) had a greater tendency to be women than did white respondents.

Minorities, with the exception of Native Americans, were more likely to be employed at public institutions than were white respondents (Table 1-11).

Table 1-8 Race by Title

ROWS - TITLE		COLUMNS - RACE					
		BLACK	NATIVE AMERI- CAN	Orien- tal	SPANISH SUR- NAMED	WHITE	OTHER
DIRFC- TOR		87	5	6	23	1249	26
		6.366	0.358	0.429	1.645	89.342	1.860
		67.424	71.429	37.500	67.647	74.434	78.788
ASSOC./ ASSIS.		12	1	1	3	146	4
		7.186	0.599	0.599	1.796	87.425	2.395
DIRECT.		9.091	14.286	6.250	8.824	8.701	12.121
FIN.AID/ OFFICER		24	1	5	6	149	3
		12.746	0.532	2.660	3.191	79.255	1.596
COUN/AD		18.182	14.286	31.250	17.647	8.880	9.091
OTHER		7		4	2	134	
		4.762		2.721	1.361	91.156	
		5.303		25.000	5.882	7.986	
COLUMN SUMS		132	7	16	34	1678	33
		6.947	0.368	0.842	1.789	88.316	1.737
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-9 Race by Age

ROWS = AGE

COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI- CAN	ORIEN- TAL	SPANISH SUR- NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	11 8.871 8.333	1 0.806 14.286	3 2.419 18.750	3 2.419 8.824	104 83.871 6.198	2 1.613 6.061	124 100.000 6.526
26-30	32 8.377 24.242	2 0.524 28.571	8 2.094 50.000	9 2.356 26.471	327 85.602 19.487	4 1.047 12.121	382 100.000 20.105
31-35	30 8.197 22.727	1 0.273 14.286	1 0.273 6.250	11 3.005 32.353	317 86.612 18.892	6 1.639 18.182	366 100.000 19.263
36-40	21 7.554 15.909	1 0.360 14.286	1 0.360 6.250	2 0.719 5.882	249 89.568 14.839	4 1.439 12.121	278 100.000 14.632
41-50	18 4.749 13.636	2 0.528 28.571	2 0.528 12.500	8 2.111 23.529	340 89.710 20.262	9 2.375 27.273	379 100.000 19.947
51-59	14 4.912 10.606		1 0.351 6.250	1 0.351 2.941	262 91.930 15.614	7 2.456 21.212	285 100.000 15.000
60+	6 6.977 4.545				79 91.860 4.708	1 1.163 3.030	86 100.000 4.526
COL SUMS	132 6.947 100.000	7 0.368 100.000	16 0.842 100.000	34 1.789 100.000	1678 88.316 100.000	33 1.737 100.000	1900 100.000

Table 1-10 Race by Sex

ROWS = SEX

COLUMNS = RACE

	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI- CAN	ORIEN- TAL	SPANISH SUR- NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
MALE	64 5.374 49.231	4 0.336 57.143	5 0.420 31.250	24 2.015 70.588	1072 90.008 63.762	22 1.847 66.667	1191 100.000 62.816
FEMALE	66 7.362 50.769	3 0.426 42.857	11 1.560 68.750	10 1.418 29.412	604 85.674 36.038	11 1.560 33.333	705 100.000 37.184
COLUMN SUMS	130 6.857 100.000	7 0.369 100.000	16 0.844 100.000	34 1.793 100.000	1676 88.397 100.000	33 1.741 100.000	1896 100.000

Table 1-11 Race by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL		COLUMNS = RACE					
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION							
	BLACK	NATIVE AMERI- CAN	ORIEN- TAL	SPANISH SUR- NAMED	WHITE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	74	1	12	21	684	12	804
	9.204	0.124	1.493	2.612	85.075	1.493	100.000
	56.061	14.286	75.000	61.765	40.811	37.500	42.383
INDEP.	54	6	2	12	850	17	941
(PRI- VATE)	5.739	0.638	0.213	1.275	90.329	1.807	100.000
	40.909	85.714	12.500	35.294	50.716	53.125	49.605
PROPRI- ETARY	4		2	1	142	3	152
	2.632		1.316	0.658	93.421	1.974	100.000
	3.030		12.500	2.941	8.473	9.375	8.013
COLUMN SUMS	132	7	16	34	1676	32	1897
	6.958	0.369	0.843	1.792	88.350	1.687	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-12 Through 1-14 NASFAA Membership of Student Financial Aid Administrators

A total of 83.8 percent of the respondents stated that they were NASFAA members.* There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between title and NASFAA membership, with Directors of Financial Aid having the highest incidence of membership (87.5%) and the "Other" category having the lowest (64.1%).

As shown in Table 1-13, respondents who stated that they were not NASFAA members tended to be slightly younger (significant at the .01 level) than NASFAA members. Furthermore, men were slightly more likely to hold NASFAA membership (85.9%) than were women (80.3%) and this relationship was significant at the .01 level. There were no significant differences in NASFAA membership among racial/ethnic groups.

*The data on NASFAA membership may be spurious to the extent that the responses may have been affected by the change in NASFAA membership from individual to institutional which occurred during the summer of 1977. It is possible, therefore, that some respondents who held membership in NASFAA, but whose institutions had not yet become members, indicated that they did not have current NASFAA membership.

Table 1-12 NASFAA Membership by Title

ROW - TITLE		COLUMN - MEMBER NASFAA?		
	YES	NO	P04 SUMS	
DIRECTOR	1217	174	1391	
	87.421	12.509	100.000	
	76.879	56.861	71.617	
ASSOC./	135	31	166	
ASSIS.	81.325	18.675	100.000	
DIRECT.	8.524	10.131	8.788	
FIN.AID	139	49	187	
OFFICER	73.797	25.203	100.000	
COUN/AD	8.718	16.011	9.899	
OTHER	93	52	145	
	64.130	35.862	100.000	
	5.875	16.991	7.676	
COLUMN	1583	306	1889	
SUMS	83.801	16.199	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 1-13 NASFAA Membership by Age

ROWS = MEMBER NASFAA?

COLUMNS = AGE

	UNDER 25	26-30	31-35	36-40	41-50	51-59	60+	ROW SUMS
YES	88	312	313	236	320	236	78	1583
	5.559	19.709	19.773	14.908	20.215	14.908	4.927	100.000
	70.968	82.322	85.989	85.818	84.433	83.392	91.765	83.801
NO	36	67	51	39	59	47	7	306
	11.765	21.895	16.667	12.745	19.281	15.359	2.288	100.000
	29.032	17.678	14.011	14.182	15.567	16.608	8.235	16.199
COL SUMS	124	379	364	275	379	283	85	1889
	6.564	20.064	19.269	14.558	20.064	14.981	4.500	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-14 NASFAA Membership by Sex

ROWS = MEMBER NASFAA?

COLUMNS = SEX

	MALE	FFEMALE	ROW SUMS
YES	1017	563	1580
	64.367	35.633	100.000
	85.895	80.114	83.820
NO	167	138	305
	54.754	45.246	100.000
	14.105	19.686	16.180
COL SUMS	1184	701	1885
	62.812	37.188	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-15 Full-Time or Part-Time Employment Status by Title

A total of 93.8 percent of the respondents were employed full time on an annual basis. Respondents employed on 9-month contracts and those employed less than full time represented only 6.2 percent of the total number of respondents. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in employment status based upon title.

Table 1-15 Employment Status by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = FULL/HALF-TIME
EMPLOYMENT

	FULL TIME	LESS THAN FULL	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	1301	97	1398
	93.062	6.938	100.000
	73.000	82.906	73.618
ASSOC./	163	4	167
ASSIS.	97.605	2.395	100.000
DIRECT.	9.147	3.419	8.794
FIN.AID	176	11	187
OFFICER	94.118	5.882	100.000
COUN/AD	9.877	9.402	9.847
OTHER	142	5	147
	96.529	3.401	100.000
	7.969	4.274	7.741
COLUMN	1782	117	1899
SUMS	93.839	6.161	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-16 Amount of Employment Time Devoted to Student Financial Aid by Title

The majority (57.8%) of the respondents spent 100 percent of their employment time on matters pertaining to student financial aid. However, there were a number of differences based upon title. Respondents in the title category of "Other" were the least likely to spend their full time devoted to financial aid concerns. Slightly over 43 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid devoted less than 100 percent of their time to financial aid.

The most striking difference between respondents who spend various amounts of employment time administering financial aid programs is based upon "the kinds of students" served by their office and whether or not their office is the central financial aid office on campus (See Tables 1-24 and 1-27). For example, 28.6 percent of the respondents in offices serving only graduate/professional students spent 100 percent of their employment time in financial aid, while the percent was almost three times as high among respondents employed in offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students. At the other end of the spectrum, only 4.5 percent of the respondents from offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students spent less than half of their employment time on financial aid matters, while the figure was over 50 percent for respondents in offices serving only graduate/professional students. These differences were significant at the .01 level.

Respondents working in the central financial aid office on a campus were more likely to spend 100 percent of their employment time in financial aid (60.5%) than respondents working in non-central aid offices (22.2%). This difference was significant at the .01 level.

Table 1-16 Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid by Title

ROWS = TITLE				COLUMNS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID	
	100%	75-99%	50-74%	LESS THAN HALF	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	79.4	28.6	14.7	17.3	140.0
TOP	56.714	20.429	10.500	12.357	100.000
	72.247	77.929	77.778	70.040	73.607
ASSOCIATE	11.8	1.8	.8	.3	16.7
ASSIST.	82.635	10.778	4.790	1.796	100.000
DIRECT.	12.557	4.905	4.233	1.215	8.780
FIN. AID	11.5	3.6	1.6	2.1	18.8
OFFICER	61.170	19.149	8.511	11.170	100.000
COORD/AD	10.464	9.809	8.466	8.502	9.824
OTHER	5.2	2.7	1.8	5.0	14.7
	15.174	18.167	12.245	34.014	100.000
	4.732	7.357	9.524	20.243	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	107.7	36.7	18.9	24.7	190.2
	57.781	19.295	9.937	12.986	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-17 Primary Other Area of Responsibility for Respondents
Devoting Less Than 100 Percent of Their Working Time
to Student Financial Aid by Title

Of the respondents reporting that they spent less than 100 percent of their employment time working in a financial aid office, approximately one-fifth indicated that the Office of Admissions was their primary other area of responsibility. 44.8 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors stated that the Office of Admissions was their primary other responsibility, and aside from the title category of "Other," it was the most prevalent choice for respondents in the remaining three title categories. Approximately an equal number of respondents stated that they had responsibilities in either the Dean of Students Office or the Business Office.

Table 1-17 Other Area of Responsibility by Title

ROWS = TITLE	PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY								
	COLUMNS = OUTSIDE FINANCIAL AID								
	DEAN OF STUDENTS OFFICE	OFFICE OF REG-ISTRAR	OFFICE OF CAR-PLN PER	OFFICE OF ADM-SSIONS	CONN-SELING CENTER	BUSI-NESS OFFICE	TEACH-ING	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIPEC-TOR	73	26	33	112	21	91	45	176	577
	12.652	4.506	5.719	19.411	3.640	15.771	7.799	30.503	100.000
	74.490	65.000	80.488	71.203	70.000	85.849	80.357	73.950	75.722
ASSOC./	3	1		13			1	11	29
ASSIS.	10.345	3.448		44.828			3.448	37.931	100.000
DIRECT.	3.061	2.500		8.497			1.786	4.622	3.806
FIN.AID	8	9	2	7	9	11	3	19	68
OFFICER	11.765	13.235	2.941	10.294	13.235	16.176	4.412	27.941	100.000
COUN/AD	8.163	22.500	4.878	4.575	30.000	10.377	5.357	7.983	8.924
OTHER	14	4	6	21		4	7	32	98
	15.909	4.545	6.818	23.864		4.545	7.955	36.364	100.000
	14.286	10.000	14.634	13.725		3.774	12.500	13.445	11.549
COLUMN SUMS	98	40	41	153	30	106	56	238	762
	12.961	5.249	5.381	20.079	3.937	13.911	7.349	31.234	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-18 Through 1-20 Number of Years of Employment in the Student Financial Aid Profession

Approximately half of the respondents reported having 6 years or more of experience in financial aid administration. Financial aid experience totaling 11 years or more was reported by 16 percent of the respondents (Table 1-18).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in years of employment based upon sex and race. For example, as shown in Table 1-19, women had a median length of employment of between 4 to 5 years, while the median for men was approximately 6 years. Whites, Blacks, and "other" racial/ethnic groups were the only respondents to have worked for 11 years or more in the financial aid profession. The majority of the respondents in the Native American, Oriental, and Spanish Surnamed groups had between 4 and 10 years of experience (Table 1-20).

Table 1-18 Years of Employment by Title

ROW - TITLE		COLUMNS - NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID					
	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	182	238	279	452	197	52	1392
TOP	13.009	17.012	19.871	32.309	14.681	3.717	100.000
	70.270	68.195	73.545	74.347	81.405	83.871	73.709
ASSOC./	20	35	36	52	19	4	166
ASSIS.	12.749	21.084	21.687	31.325	11.446	2.410	100.000
DIRECT.	7.122	10.029	9.524	8.551	7.851	6.452	8.746
FIN.AID	35	49	38	54	11	1	189
OFFICE EP	18.617	26.064	20.213	28.723	5.851	0.532	100.000
COUN/AD	13.514	14.040	10.053	8.882	4.545	1.613	9.905
OTHERP	22	27	26	50	15	5	145
	15.172	18.621	17.931	34.493	10.345	3.448	100.000
	3.494	7.736	6.878	8.224	6.198	8.065	7.640
COLUMN SUMS	259	349	379	609	242	62	1898
	13.646	18.348	19.416	32.014	12.750	3.267	100.000
	100.970	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-19 Years of Employment by Sex

ROWS = SEX

COLUMNS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN
FINANCIAL AID

	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
MALE	145	195	211	402	188	50	1191
	12.175	16.373	17.716	33.753	15.785	4.198	100.000
	55.945	55.714	56.267	66.227	78.008	80.645	62.883
FEMALE	114	155	164	205	53	12	703
	16.216	22.048	23.329	29.161	7.539	1.707	100.000
	44.015	44.286	43.733	33.773	21.992	19.355	37.117
COLUMN SUMS	259	350	375	607	241	62	1894
	13.675	18.479	19.799	32.049	12.724	3.273	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-20 Years of Employment by Race

ROWS = RACE

COLUMNS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN
FINANCIAL AID

	1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	2-3 YEARS EXPER.	4-5 YEARS	6-10 YEARS	11-15 YEARS	16+ YEARS	ROW SUMS
BLACK	17	29	27	43	11	4	131
	12.977	22.137	20.611	32.824	8.397	3.053	100.000
	6.568	8.309	7.124	7.072	4.500	6.349	6.887
NATIVE AMERI- CAN	1		1	5			7
	14.286		14.286	71.429			100.000
	0.386		2.264	0.822			0.368
ORTEN- TAL	1	6	7	2			16
	6.250	37.500	43.750	12.500			100.000
	0.386	1.719	1.847	0.329			0.841
SPANISH SUR- NAMED	5	4	15	10			34
	14.706	11.765	44.118	29.412			100.000
	1.931	1.146	3.959	1.645			1.788
WHITE	232	302	326	539	226	56	1681
	13.801	17.965	19.393	32.064	13.444	3.331	100.000
	89.575	86.533	86.016	88.651	92.623	88.889	88.381
OTHER	3	8	3	9	7	3	33
	9.091	24.242	9.091	27.273	21.212	9.091	100.000
	1.158	2.292	0.792	1.480	2.869	4.762	1.735
COLUMN SUMS	259	349	379	608	244	63	1902
	13.617	18.349	19.926	31.966	12.829	3.312	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-21 Highest Level of Education Achieved by Student Financial Aid Administrators

Approximately half of the respondents had a masters degree and 5.9 percent held the doctorate.

Table 1-21 Educational Level by Title

ROWS = TITLE		EDUCATION: COLUMNS = HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED				
	DOCTOR- RATE	MASTERS	DOCTOR- LORS	ASSO- CIATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	74	725	381	59	150	1393
	5.593	52.046	27.351	4.215	10.768	100.000
	69.643	75.916	69.399	76.623	75.000	73.587
ASSOC./DIRECT.	8	82	64	3	10	167
	4.790	49.102	38.323	1.796	5.988	100.000
	7.143	8.586	11.658	3.896	5.000	8.822
FIN. AID OFFICER	6	77	69	10	26	188
	3.191	40.957	36.702	5.319	13.830	100.000
	5.157	8.063	12.568	12.987	13.000	9.931
OTHER	20	71	35	5	14	145
	13.793	48.966	24.138	3.448	9.655	100.000
	17.857	7.435	6.375	6.494	7.000	7.660
COLUMN SUMS	112	955	549	77	200	1893
	5.117	50.449	29.002	4.068	10.565	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-22 Geographic Location by Title

Over 58 percent of the respondents were from either states comprising either EASFAA (28.3%) or MASFAA (29.9%). Respondents from SASFAA (15.5%) and SWASFAA (9.1%) represented just over one-fourth of the total. RMAFSA (4.7%) and WASFAA (12.4%) accounted for the remainder of the responses.

Table 1-22 Geographic Location by Title

ROWS = TITLE		REGIONAL COLUMNS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES						
		FASFAA	SASFAA	MASFAA	SWASFAA	RMAFSA	WASFAA	ROW SUMS
DIREC- TOR		392	221	397	139	75	154	1378
		28.447	16.018	28.810	10.087	5.443	11.176	100.000
		74.102	76.207	70.766	81.287	85.227	66.094	73.611
ASSOC./		46	17	64	10	4	21	162
ASSIS.		28.395	10.494	32.506	6.173	2.469	12.963	100.000
DIRECT.		8.696	5.862	11.408	5.848	4.545	9.013	8.654
PIN.AID		55	28	52	10	4	36	185
OFFICER		29.730	15.135	28.108	5.405	2.162	19.459	100.000
COUN/AD		10.397	9.655	9.269	5.848	4.545	15.451	9.882
OTHER		36	24	43	12	5	22	147
		24.490	16.327	32.653	8.163	1.401	14.966	100.000
		6.805	8.276	8.556	7.018	5.682	9.442	7.853
COLUMN SUMS		529	290	561	171	88	233	1872
		28.259	15.491	29.958	9.135	4.701	12.447	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-23 and 1-24 The Academic Level(s) of Students Served

Just over one-half of the respondents were employed in offices which only served undergraduate students. 38.5 percent were employed in offices serving both undergraduate and graduate students, and 9.7 worked in offices which only served graduate students.

As indicated in the narrative for Table 1-16, respondents employed in offices with graduate/professional clienteles were more likely to be less than full time than were respondents in other offices (significant at the .01 level).

Table 1-23 Academic Level of Students Served by Title

ROWS = TITLE		KINDS OF STUDENTS COLUMNS = SERVED			
		GR/PROF ONLY	UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	UNDERGR GR/PROF	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR		95	782	517	1394
		6.815	56.098	37.088	100.000
		51.630	79.715	70.919	73.601
ASSOC./		9	28	130	167
ASSIS.		5.387	16.766	77.844	100.000
DIRECT.		4.091	2.854	17.833	8.817
FIN.AID		38	99	50	187
OFFICER		20.321	52.941	26.738	100.000
COUN/AD		20.652	10.092	6.859	9.873
OTHER		42	72	32	146
		28.767	49.315	21.918	100.000
		22.426	7.339	4.390	7.709
COLUMN		384	981	729	1094
SUMS		9.715	51.795	38.490	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-24 Academic Level of Students Served by
Percentage of Employment Time Devoted
to Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID
COLUMNS = SERVED KINDS OF STUDENTS

	GR/PROF ONLY	UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	UNDGRG GR/PROF	ROW SUMS
100%	53	475	571	1099
	4.823	43.221	51.956	100.000
	28.649	48.272	78.112	57.842
75-99%	14	261	91	366
	3.825	71.311	24.863	100.000
	7.568	26.524	18.449	19.263
50-74%	24	127	36	187
	12.834	67.914	19.251	100.000
	12.973	12.907	4.925	9.842
LFSS	94	121	33	248
THAN	37.903	48.790	13.306	100.000
HALF	50.811	12.297	4.514	13.053
COLUMN	185	984	731	1900
SUMS	9.737	51.789	38.474	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 1-25 Through 1-27 Is Your Office Considered the Central Financial Aid Office on Campus?

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between whether or not respondents were employed in central financial aid offices by title, by kinds of students served, and by percentage of employment time spent in financial aid. Almost 93 percent of the respondents were employed in the central student financial aid office on their campus. Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors and those in the title category of "Other" were more likely to be employed in a non-central financial aid office than were Directors and Associate/Assistant Directors.

As shown in Table 1-26, respondents from offices serving only graduate/professional students were more likely to be employed in non-central offices than were other respondents. Furthermore, as the percentage of employment time spent in the financial aid office decreased, so did the likelihood that the respondent would work in a central financial aid office (Table 1-27).

Table 1-25 Central Financial Aid Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	1332	63	1395	
	95.488	4.516	100.000	
	75.639	47.015	73.615	
ASSOC./ASSIS.	160	7	167	
	95.808	4.192	100.000	
DIRECT.	9.086	5.224	8.813	
FIN. AID OFFICER	165	22	187	
	88.235	11.765	100.000	
COUN./ADV.	9.370	16.418	9.868	
OTHER	104	42	146	
	71.233	28.767	100.000	
	5.906	31.343	7.704	
COLUMN SUMS	1761	134	1895	
	92.929	7.071	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 1-26 Central Financial Aid Office by
Kinds of Students Served

KINDS OF STUDENTS			ROW SUMS
ROWS = SERVED			
	YES	NO	
GR/PROF	85	99	184
ONLY	46.196	53.804	100.000
	4.819	73.333	9.689
UNDERGR	974	12	986
STUD.	98.783	1.217	100.000
ONLY	55.215	8.889	51.922
UNDGRE	705	24	729
GR/PROF	96.708	3.292	100.000
	39.966	17.778	38.389
COLUMN	1764	135	1899
SUMS	92.891	7.109	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-27 Central Financial Aid Office by Percentage
of Employment Time in Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID			COLUMNS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	1069	30	1099
	97.270	2.730	100.000
	60.532	22.222	57.812
75-99%	354	13	367
	96.458	3.542	100.000
	20.045	9.630	19.306
50-74%	169	18	187
	90.374	9.626	100.000
	9.570	13.333	9.837
LESS THAN HALF	174	74	248
	70.161	29.839	100.000
	9.853	54.815	13.046
COLUMN SUMS	1766	135	1901
	92.898	7.102	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 1-28 Through 1-32 Tenure

Approximately 83.6 percent of the respondents were not tenured. 4.8 percent of the respondents stated that they would be eligible for tenure in the future, while 16.4 percent of those completing the questionnaire currently had tenure.

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in the tenure status of respondents based upon percentage of employment time in financial aid, number of years in financial aid, and institutional control. As the percentage of employment time spent in financial aid decreased from 100 percent to under 50 percent, the likelihood that respondents had tenure almost doubled (Table 1-29). As might be expected, as years of employment in financial aid increased so too did the likelihood of having tenure (Table 1-30).

Respondents from public and proprietary institutions were more likely to report tenure than those from independent institutions.

There were no differences (at the .05 level) in whether respondents had tenure based upon sex or types of students served by the financial aid office.

Table 1-28 Tenure Status by Title

ROWS = TITLE COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGIBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI- GIBLE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	215	56	1046	1317
	16.32%	4.25%	79.42%	100.00%
	73.37%	65.11%	74.07%	73.53%
ASSOC./	12	9	140	161
ASSIS.	7.45%	5.59%	86.95%	100.00%
DIRECT.	4.09%	10.46%	9.91%	8.98%
FIN.AID	39	12	124	175
OFFICER	22.28%	6.85%	70.85%	100.00%
COHN/AD	11.31%	13.95%	8.78%	9.77%
OTHER	27	9	102	138
	19.56%	6.52%	71.91%	100.00%
	9.21%	10.46%	7.22%	7.70%
COLUMN SUMS	293	86	1412	1791
	16.36%	4.80%	78.83%	100.00%
	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Table 1-29 Tenure Status by Percentage of Employment Time Devoted to Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID				COLUMNS = TENURE
	HAVE TENURE	ELIGIBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI- GIBLE	ROW SUMS
100%	135	41	872	1048
	12.882	3.912	83.206	100.000
	45.918	47.674	61.582	58.352
75-99%	69	22	259	350
	19.714	6.286	74.000	100.000
	23.469	25.581	18.291	19.488
50-74%	36	5	132	173
	20.809	2.890	76.301	100.000
	12.245	5.814	9.322	9.633
LESS THAN HALF	54	18	153	225
	24.000	8.000	68.000	100.000
	18.367	20.930	10.805	12.528
COLUMN SUMS	294	86	1416	1796
	16.370	4.788	78.842	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-30 Tenure Status by Years Worked in Financial Aid

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID				COLUMNS = TENURE
	HAVE TENURE	ELIGIBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI- GIBLE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	23	21	189	233
	9.871	9.013	81.116	100.000
	7.823	24.419	13.376	12.995
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	44	12	271	327
	13.456	3.670	82.875	100.000
	14.966	13.953	19.179	18.238
4-5 YEARS	47	28	282	357
	13.165	7.843	78.992	100.000
	15.986	32.558	19.958	19.911
6-10 YEARS	115	19	444	578
	19.896	3.287	76.817	100.000
	39.116	22.093	11.423	32.236
11-15 YEARS	44	6	187	237
	18.565	2.532	78.903	100.000
	14.966	6.977	13.234	13.218
16+ YEARS	21		40	61
	34.426		65.574	100.000
	7.143		2.831	3.402
COLUMN SUMS	294	86	1413	1793
	16.397	4.796	78.806	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-31 Tenure Status by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGIBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI- GIBLE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	185	47	555	787
	27.507	5.972	70.521	100.000
	67.140	54.651	39.390	44.016
INDEP.	79	37	770	886
(PRI- VATE)	8.916	4.176	86.907	100.000
	26.962	43.023	54.649	49.553
PROPRI- ETARY	29	2	84	115
	25.217	1.739	73.043	100.000
	9.898	2.126	5.962	6.432
COLUMN SUMS	293	86	1409	1788
	16.387	4.810	78.803	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 1-32 Tenure Status by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE COLUMNS = TENURE

	HAVE TENURE	ELIGIBLE IN FUTURE	NOT ELI- GIBLE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	94	32	417	543
	17.311	5.893	76.796	100.000
	32.082	37.647	29.595	30.386
1000- 1999	67	23	443	533
	12.570	4.315	83.114	100.000
	22.867	27.059	31.441	29.827
4000- 9999	64	14	226	304
	21.053	4.605	74.342	100.000
	21.843	16.471	16.040	17.012
10,000- 19,999	38	14	180	232
	16.379	6.034	77.586	100.000
	12.969	16.471	12.775	12.983
20,000+	30	2	143	175
	17.143	1.143	81.714	100.000
	10.239	2.353	10.149	9.793
COLUMN SUMS	293	85	1409	1787
	16.396	4.757	78.847	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section B

Salaries of Student Financial
Aid Administrators

TABLES 2-1 Through 2-9 Salaries*

In September, 1977, the median salary for 1,156 Directors of Financial Aid was approximately \$16,250 (Table 2-1). Twenty-five percent of Directors earned salaries below \$13,000, while one-fifth had salaries of \$21,000 or over.

Salaries for other respondents such as Associate/Assistant Directors are based on a smaller sample, since the majority of NASFAA members in September, 1977, were Directors of Financial Aid. Therefore, the salaries for the other categories are less generalizable to the total population than are the salaries for Directors. The median salary for the 160 Associate/Assistant Directors was \$14,700. The median salary for the 158 Financial Aid Advisors/Counselors/Officers was \$13,870.

Respondents whose title fell into a category other than the above categories had a median annual salary of \$15,200. However, the "other" category included individuals in a wide variety of positions from Student Services Coordinators to Deans of Students. This diversity of job classifications, and the fact that only 94 respondents were in the "other" category, limits the usefulness of the salary information in this category.

Institutional control and size are primary determinants of salary level. For example, Directors' salaries were significantly higher (at the .01 level) at public institutions than at either independent or proprietary institutions. Directors at public institutions had a median salary of \$19,050 and over one-third of the Directors had salaries of \$21,000 or over per year. The median salary for Directors at independent institutions was \$14,430 and only 10.2 percent of the Directors had salaries of \$21,000 or over. The median yearly salary for Directors of Financial Aid at proprietary institutions was the lowest of the three groups at \$12,620 (Table 2-2).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in Directors' salaries based upon institutional size. For institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 students, median Directors' salaries were \$12,560, while they were in excess of \$23,180 at institutions with enrollments of 20,000 and over (Table 2-3).

Table 2-1 highlighted the median salary of approximately \$16,250 for Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey. Table 2-3 identifies the fact that over 63 percent of the respondents were employed by institutions with enrollments of under 4,000 students and that Directors employed at these institutions had median salary levels below \$16,250.

Previous tables have shown that there are differences in Directors' salaries by institutional type as well as by institutional size. Table 2-4 permits a detailed examination of the effects of both

*Respondents are included in tables displaying salaries or attitudes about salaries if they were employed full time and devoted at least 50 percent of their employment time to financial aid.

institutional type and size on Directors' salaries (institutional types with low numbers of respondents are not divided into size categories). For example, in the 84 public universities with an enrollment of under 7,000 students, the median Director's salary was \$17,750. At the 53 institutions with enrollments of 20,000 or more, the median Director's salary was \$24,580.

Salaries for other title categories by institutional type, control, and size are shown in Tables 2-5 and 2-6. Directors at public institutions with less than three years' experience have a median salary of \$15,310, while the comparable figure for those have 3-5 years of experience is \$17,670. Directors with six or more years of experience who are employed at public institutions have a median average salary of \$20,370. The same tendency in Directors' salaries is noticeable at independent institutions as well as at proprietary institutions (Tables 2-7, 2-8, 2-9). To some extent, these differences are a result of the tendency for individuals to be employed at larger institutions as their length of employment in the financial aid profession increases.

Table 2-1 Salary by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	47 4.066 65.278	104 8.997 65.409	138 11.938 63.594	177 15.311 73.750	178 15.398 75.105	145 12.543 71.429	134 11.592 81.212	122 10.554 85.315	61 5.277 85.915	50 4.325 81.967	1156 100.000 73.724
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.	5 3.125 6.944	24 15.000 15.094	28 17.500 12.903	27 16.875 11.250	29 18.125 12.236	20 12.500 9.852	14 8.750 8.485	8 5.000 5.594	4 2.500 5.634	1 0.625 1.639	160 100.000 10.204
FIN.AID OFFICER	15 9.494	22 13.924	32 20.253	23 14.557	20 12.658	21 13.291	13 8.228	6 3.797	3 1.899	3 1.899	158 100.000
COUN/AD	20.833	13.836	14.747	9.583	8.439	10.345	7.879	4.196	4.225	4.918	10.077
OTHER	5 5.119 6.944	9 9.574 5.660	19 20.213 8.756	13 13.830 5.417	10 10.638 4.219	17 18.085 8.374	4 4.255 2.424	7 7.447 4.895	3 3.191 4.225	7 7.447 11.475	94 100.000 5.995
COLUMN SUMS	72 4.592 100.000	159 10.140 100.000	217 13.819 100.000	240 15.306 100.000	237 15.115 100.000	203 12.946 100.000	165 10.523 100.000	143 9.120 100.000	71 4.528 100.000	61 3.890 100.000	1568 100.000

Table 2-2 Salaries for Directors of Financial
Aid by Institutional Control

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION:

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	5	11	12	49	79	81	80	86	42	33	478
	1.046	2.301	2.510	10.251	16.527	16.946	16.736	17.992	8.787	6.904	100.000
	10.870	10.577	8.696	27.941	44.886	55.862	59.701	71.074	68.852	67.347	41.565
INDEP.	30	74	105	112	86	59	53	33	15	11	578
(PRI-	5.190	12.803	18.166	19.377	14.879	10.208	9.170	5.709	2.595	1.903	100.000
VATE)	65.217	71.154	76.087	63.636	48.864	40.690	39.552	27.273	24.590	22.449	50.261
PROPRI-	11	19	21	15	11	5	1	2	4	5	94
ETARY	11.702	20.213	22.340	15.957	11.702	5.319	1.064	2.128	4.255	5.319	100.000
	21.913	18.269	15.217	8.523	6.250	3.448	0.746	1.653	6.557	10.204	8.174
COLUMN	46	104	138	176	176	145	134	121	61	49	1150
SUMS	4.000	9.043	12.000	15.304	15.304	12.609	11.652	10.522	5.304	4.261	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-2A Salaries for Associate/Assistant Directors
by Institutional Type

TITLE = ASSOC./
ASSIS.
DIRECT.

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	2	9	17	19	17	10	6	4		86
	2.326	2.326	10.465	19.767	22.093	19.767	11.628	6.977	4.651		100.000
	40.000	8.333	32.143	62.963	65.517	85.000	71.429	75.000	100.000		53.750
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	3	22	19	10	10	3	4	2		1	74
	4.054	29.730	25.676	13.514	13.514	4.054	5.405	2.703		1.351	100.000
	60.000	91.667	67.857	37.037	34.483	15.000	28.571	25.000		100.000	46.250
PROPRI- ETARY											
COLUMN SUMS	5	24	28	27	29	20	14	8	4	1	160
	3.125	15.000	17.500	15.875	13.125	12.500	8.750	5.000	2.500	0.625	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-2B Salaries for Financial Aid Officers,
Counselors, Advisors by Institutional Type

TITLE = FIN.AID
OFFICER
COUN/AD

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	3	6	14	13	14	18	7	4	3	3	85
	3.529	7.059	16.471	15.294	16.471	21.176	8.235	4.706	3.529	3.529	100.000
	20.000	27.273	43.750	56.522	70.000	85.714	53.846	66.667	100.000	100.000	53.797
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	9	9	15	10	5	3	6	2			59
	15.254	15.254	25.424	16.949	8.475	5.085	10.169	3.390			100.000
	60.000	40.909	46.875	43.478	25.000	14.286	46.154	33.333			37.342
PROPRI- ETARY	3	7	3		1						14
	21.429	50.000	21.429		7.143						100.000
	20.000	31.818	9.375		5.000						8.861
COLUMN SUMS	15	22	32	23	20	21	13	6	3	3	158
	9.494	13.924	20.253	14.557	12.658	13.291	8.228	3.797	1.899	1.899	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-3 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors
by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS - SIZE

COLUMNS - SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	40 11.765 85.106	77 22.647 74.038	68 20.000 49.635	63 18.529 35.593	39 11.471 22.159	25 7.353 17.241	12 3.529 9.023	10 2.941 8.264	5 1.471 8.197	1 0.294 2.000	340 100.000 29.540
1000- 3999	7 1.804 14.894	23 5.928 22.115	61 15.722 44.526	88 22.680 49.718	85 21.907 48.295	52 13.402 35.862	42 10.825 31.579	18 4.639 14.876	4 1.031 6.557	8 2.062 16.003	388 100.000 33.710
4000- 9999		2 0.926 1.923	7 3.241 5.109	17 7.870 9.605	41 18.981 23.295	42 19.444 28.966	42 19.444 31.579	39 18.056 32.231	17 7.870 27.869	9 4.167 18.003	216 100.000 18.766
10,000- 19,999		2 1.504 1.923	1 0.752 0.730	7 5.263 3.955	7 5.263 3.977	16 12.030 11.034	24 18.045 18.045	43 32.331 35.537	20 15.038 32.787	13 9.774 26.003	133 100.000 11.555
20,000+				2 2.703 1.130	4 5.405 2.273	10 13.514 6.897	13 17.568 9.774	11 14.865 9.091	15 20.270 24.590	19 25.676 38.000	74 100.000 6.429
COLUMN SUMS	47 4.083 100.000	104 9.036 100.000	137 11.903 100.000	177 15.378 100.000	176 15.291 100.000	145 12.598 100.000	133 11.555 100.000	121 10.513 100.000	61 5.300 100.000	50 4.344 100.000	1151 100.000 100.000

Table 2-4 Salaries for Directors of Financial Aid
by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

TITLE = DIRECTOR											
ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE		COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL									
	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000-10,999	\$11,000-12,999	\$13,000-14,999	\$15,000-16,999	\$17,000-18,999	\$19,000-20,999	\$21,000-23,999	\$24,000-26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		1	3	10	22	16	9	16	2	5	84
4 YEAR		1.190	3.571	11.905	26.190	19.048	10.714	19.048	2.381	5.952	100.000
<7000		0.971	2.256	5.780	12.644	11.268	7.031	13.333	10.870	7.473	
PUBLIC			1	1	6	20	19	34	11	4	96
4 YEAR			1.042	1.042	6.250	20.833	19.792	35.417	11.458	4.167	100.000
7-19999			0.752	0.578	3.448	14.085	14.844	28.333	18.333	8.696	8.541
PUBLIC					2	6	7	9	13	16	53
4 YEAR					3.774	11.321	13.208	16.981	24.528	30.189	100.000
20,000+					1.149	4.225	5.469	7.500	21.667	34.783	4.715
PUBLIC		2		8	12	5	3	1			31
4 YEAR		6.452		25.806	38.710	16.129	9.677	3.226			100.000
<4000		1.942		4.624	6.897	3.521	2.344	0.833			2.758
PUBLIC			1	6		5	5	4	2	1	24
4 YEAR			4.167	25.000		20.833	20.833	16.667	8.333	4.167	100.000
4,000+			0.752	3.468		3.521	3.906	3.333	3.333	2.174	2.135
PUBLIC	4	6	5	14	17	9	9	2	1	1	68
2 YEAR	5.882	8.824	7.353	20.588	25.000	13.235	13.235	2.941	1.471	1.471	100.000
<4000	8.889	5.825	3.759	8.092	9.770	6.338	7.031	1.667	1.667	2.174	6.050
PUBLIC				5	10	7	21	17	9	4	73
2 YEAR				6.849	13.699	9.589	28.767	23.288	12.329	5.479	100.000
4,000+				2.890	5.747	4.930	16.406	14.167	15.000	8.696	6.495
PUBLIC				3	3	2					8
GRAD/PROF				37.500	37.500	25.000					100.000
				1.734	1.724	1.408					0.712
INDEP	2	6	21	27	22	14	10	5	1		108
4 YEAR	1.852	5.556	19.444	25.000	20.370	12.963	9.259	4.630	0.926		100.000
<4000	4.444	5.825	15.789	15.607	12.644	9.859	7.813	4.167	1.667		9.609
INDEP		1	2	6	13	14	14	11	12	10	83
4 YEAR		1.205	2.410	7.229	15.663	16.867	16.867	13.253	14.458	12.048	100.000
4,000+		0.971	1.504	3.468	7.471	9.859	10.938	9.167	20.000	21.739	7.384
INDEP	13	41	26	26	14	7	2	2			131
4 YEAR	9.424	31.298	19.847	19.847	10.687	5.344	1.527	1.527			100.000
<1000	28.889	39.806	19.549	15.029	8.046	4.930	1.563	1.667			11.655
INDEP	3	11	31	28	17	14	9	4			117
4 YEAR	2.564	9.402	26.496	23.932	14.530	11.966	7.692	3.419			100.000
1-1,499	6.667	10.680	23.308	16.185	9.770	9.859	7.031	3.333			10.409
INDEP		2	1	7	9	4	10	4			37
4 YEAR		5.405	2.703	18.919	24.324	10.811	27.027	10.811			100.000
2,000+		1.942	0.752	4.046	5.172	2.817	7.813	3.333			3.292
INDEP	10	7	7	6	5	1	2	4			42
2 YEAR	21.810	16.667	16.667	14.286	11.905	2.381	4.762	9.524			100.000
	22.222	6.796	5.263	3.468	2.874	0.704	1.563	3.333			3.737
INDEP		2	8	6	4	3	3	2	1		29
GRAD/PROF		6.897	27.586	20.690	13.793	10.345	10.345	6.897	3.448		100.000
		1.942	6.015	3.468	2.299	2.113	2.344	1.667	1.667		2.580
PUBLIC		3		3	1	1	1	1	1		11
INDEP		27.273		27.273	9.091	9.091	9.091	9.091	9.091		100.000
NURSING		2.913		1.734	0.575	0.704	0.781	0.833	1.667		0.979
PUBLIC	2	2	6	2	6	9	3	2	3		35
INDEP	5.714	5.714	17.143	5.714	17.143	25.714	8.571	5.714	8.571		100.000
VOC.TEC	4.444	1.942	4.511	1.156	3.448	6.338	2.344	1.667	5.000		3.114
PROPRI.	6	11	13	12	4	4	1		3	5	59
VOC.TEC	10.169	18.644	22.034	20.339	6.780	6.780	1.695		5.085	8.475	100.000
	13.133	10.680	9.774	6.916	2.299	2.817	0.781		5.000	10.870	5.249
ALL	5	8	8	3	7	1		2	1		35
OTHER	14.286	22.857	22.857	8.571	20.000	2.857		5.714	2.857		100.000
PROPRI.	11.111	7.767	6.015	1.734	4.023	0.704		1.667	1.667		3.114
COLUMN SUMS	45	103	133	173	174	142	128	120	60	46	1124
	4.004	9.164	11.833	15.391	15.400	12.633	11.388	10.676	5.338	4.093	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-5 Salaries for Associate/Assistant Directors of Financial Aid by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ASSOC./
TITLE = ASSIS.
DIRRECT.

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000-10,999	\$11,000-12,999	\$13,000-14,999	\$15,000-16,999	\$17,000-18,999	\$19,000-20,999	\$21,000-23,999	\$24,000-26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		1	1	2	2	1		2			9
4 YEAR+ <7000		11.111 4.348	11.111 3.846	22.222 7.407	22.222 7.143	11.111 5.000		22.222 25.000			100.000 5.769
PUBLIC			1	5	8	5	3	1			23
4 YEAR+ 7-19999			4.348 3.846	21.739 18.519	34.783 28.571	21.739 25.000	13.043 21.429	4.348 12.500			100.000 14.744
PUBLIC			3	9	6	7	7	3	4		39
4 YEAR+ 20,000+			7.692 11.538	23.077 33.333	15.385 21.429	17.949 35.000	17.949 50.000	7.692 37.500	10.256 100.000		100.000 25.000
PUBLIC			1	1							2
4 YEAR+ <4000			50.000 3.846	50.000 3.704							100.000 1.282
PUBLIC					1	3					4
4 YEAR+ 4,300+					25.000 3.571	75.000 15.000					100.000 2.564
PUBLIC	1		1								2
2 YEAR+ <4000	50.000 20.000		50.000 3.846								100.000 1.282
PUBLIC	1	1	1		1	1					5
2 YEAR+ 4,000+	20.000 20.000	20.000 4.348	20.000 3.846		20.000 3.571	20.000 5.000					100.000 3.205
PUBLIC, GRAD/PROF											
INDEP	1	5	5	3	1						15
4 YEAR+ <4000	6.667 20.000	33.333 21.739	33.333 19.231	20.000 11.111	6.667 3.571						100.000 9.615
INDEP		2	7	6	8	2	3	2		1	31
4 YEAR+ 4,000+		6.452 8.696	22.581 26.923	19.355 22.222	25.806 28.571	6.452 10.000	9.677 21.429	6.452 25.000		3.226 100.000	100.000 19.872
INDEP	1	5									6
4 YEAR+ <1000	16.667 20.000	83.333 21.739									100.000 3.846
INDEP		3	1								4
4 YEAR+ 1-1,999		75.000 13.043	25.000 3.846								100.000 2.564
INDEP		4	3	1	1		1				10
4 YEAR+ 2,000+		40.000 17.391	30.000 11.538	10.000 3.704	10.000 3.571		10.000 7.143				100.000 6.410
INDEP	1										1
2 YEAR	100.000 20.000										100.000 0.641
INDEP		2	2			1					5
GRAD/PROF		40.000 8.696	40.000 7.692			20.000 5.000					100.000 3.205
PUBLIC/INDEP NURSING											
PUBLIC/INDEP VOC.TEC											
PROPRI. VOC.TEC											
ALL OTHER PROPRI.											
COLUMN SUMS	5 1.205 100.000	23 14.744 100.000	26 16.667 100.000	27 17.308 100.000	28 17.949 100.000	20 12.821 100.000	14 8.974 100.000	8 5.128 100.000	4 2.564 100.000	1 0.641 100.000	156 100.000 100.000

Table 2-6 Salaries for Financial Aid Officers, Counselors,
Advisors by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

FIN.AID
TITLE = OFFICER
COUN/AD

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC 4 YEAR+ <7000	1 25.000 6.667				1 25.000 5.263		2 50.000 15.385				4 100.000 2.614
PUBLIC 4 YEAR+ 7-19999	1 14.286 6.667	1 14.286 4.762			2 28.571 10.526	2 28.571 10.526				1 14.286 33.333	7 100.000 4.575
PUBLIC 4 YEAR+ 20,000+		1 7.692 4.762	4 30.769 12.903	4 30.769 17.391	3 23.077 15.789			1 7.692 33.333			13 100.000 8.497
PUBLIC 4 YEAR <4000		1 25.000 4.762		1 25.000 4.348		2 50.000 10.526					4 100.000 2.614
PUBLIC 4 YEAR 4,000+											
PUBLIC 2 YEAR <4000	1 7.143 6.667		2 14.286 6.452	4 28.571 17.391	3 21.429 15.789		2 14.286 15.385	1 7.143 16.667	1 7.143 33.333		14 100.000 9.150
PUBLIC 2 YEAR 4,000+			2 9.524 6.452	3 14.286 13.043	2 9.524 10.526	7 33.333 36.842	3 14.286 23.077	1 4.762 16.667	1 4.762 33.333	2 9.524 66.667	21 100.000 13.725
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROP		1 12.500 4.762	3 37.500 9.677		1 12.500 5.263	2 25.000 10.526		1 12.500 16.667			8 100.000 5.229
INDEP 4 YEAR+ <4000	3 33.333 20.000		1 11.111 3.226	1 11.111 4.348	1 11.111 5.263	1 11.111 5.263	1 11.111 7.692	1 11.111 16.667			9 100.000 5.882
INDEP 4 YEAR+ 4,000+		1 12.500 4.762	3 37.500 9.677	1 12.500 4.348	1 12.500 5.263		1 12.500 7.692	1 12.500 16.667			8 100.000 5.229
INDEP 4 YEAR <1000	2 28.571 13.333	4 57.143 19.048	1 14.286 3.226								7 100.000 4.575
INDEP 4 YEAR 1-1,999		1 16.667 4.762	3 50.000 9.677	2 33.333 8.696							6 100.000 3.922
INDEP 4 YEAR 2,000+			2 66.667 6.452		1 33.333 5.263						3 100.000 1.961
INDEP 2 YEAR	2 40.000 13.333		2 40.000 6.452	1 20.000 4.348							5 100.000 3.268
INDEP GRAD/ PROP	2 11.111 11.333	2 11.111 4.524	1 5.556 3.226	5 27.778 21.739	2 11.111 10.526	2 11.111 10.526	4 22.222 30.769				18 100.000 11.765
PUBLIC INDEP NURSING		1 33.333 4.762	1 33.333 3.226			1 33.333 5.263					3 100.000 1.961
PUBLIC INDEP VOC.TEC		1 11.111 4.762	3 33.333 9.677	1 11.111 4.348	1 11.111 5.263	2 22.222 10.526		1 11.111 16.667			9 100.000 5.882
PROPRI. VOC.TEC	3 33.333 20.000	3 33.333 14.286	2 22.222 6.452		1 11.111 5.263						9 100.000 5.882
ALL OTHER PROPRI.		4 80.000 19.048	1 20.000 3.226								5 100.000 3.268
COLUMN SUMS	15 9.804 100.000	21 13.725 100.000	31 20.261 100.000	23 15.033 100.000	19 12.418 100.000	19 12.418 100.000	13 8.497 100.000	6 3.922 100.000	3 1.961 100.000	3 1.961 100.000	153 100.000

Table 2-7 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (3 Years or Less)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 3 YEARS
FINANCIAL AID OR LESS

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	2	5	7	24	19	9	9	3	1	3	82
	2.439	6.098	8.537	29.268	23.171	10.976	10.976	3.659	1.220	3.659	100.000
	7.407	7.937	9.211	31.169	52.778	45.000	69.231	50.000	25.000	75.000	25.153
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	19	42	59	46	13	9	4	3	3	1	199
	9.548	21.106	29.648	23.116	6.533	4.523	2.010	1.508	1.508	0.503	100.000
	70.370	66.667	77.632	59.740	36.111	45.000	30.769	50.000	75.000	25.000	61.043
PROPRI- ETARY	6	16	10	7	4	2					45
	13.333	35.556	22.222	15.556	8.889	4.444					100.000
	22.222	25.397	13.158	9.091	11.111	10.000					13.804
COLUMN SUMS	27	63	76	77	36	20	13	6	4	4	326
	8.282	19.325	23.313	23.620	11.043	6.135	3.988	1.840	1.227	1.227	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-8 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (4-5 Years)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 4-5
FINANCIAL AID YEARS

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	3	3	2	14	16	15	17	9	5	2	86
	3.488	3.488	2.326	16.279	18.605	17.442	19.767	10.465	5.814	2.325	100.000
	33.333	14.286	8.696	35.000	37.209	39.474	70.833	75.000	83.333	50.000	39.091
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	3	15	16	19	25	22	7	2	1		110
	2.727	13.636	14.545	17.273	22.727	20.000	6.364	1.818	0.909		100.000
	33.333	71.429	69.565	47.500	58.140	57.895	29.167	16.667	16.667		50.000
PROPRI- ETARY	3	3	5	7	2	1		1		2	24
	12.500	12.500	20.833	29.167	8.333	4.167		4.167		8.333	100.000
	33.333	14.286	21.739	17.500	4.651	2.632		8.333		50.000	10.909
COLUMN SUMS	9	21	23	40	43	36	24	12	6	4	220
	4.091	9.545	10.455	18.182	19.545	17.273	10.909	5.455	2.727	1.818	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 2-9 Salaries for Financial Aid Directors by Institutional Control and by Years Worked (6+ Years)

NO. YEARS WORKED IN = 6+
FINANCIAL AID YEARS

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		3	3	11	44	57	54	74	36	28	310
		0.968	0.968	3.548	14.194	18.387	17.419	23.871	11.613	9.032	100.000
		15.000	7.692	18.644	45.833	65.517	55.670	71.845	70.588	68.293	51.410
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	8	17	30	47	47	28	42	28	11	10	268
	2.985	6.343	11.194	17.537	17.537	10.448	15.672	10.448	4.104	3.731	100.000
	80.000	85.000	76.923	79.661	48.958	32.184	43.299	27.184	21.569	24.390	44.444
PROPRI- ETARY	2		6	1	5	2	1	1	4	3	25
	8.030		24.000	4.000	20.000	8.000	4.000	4.000	16.000	12.000	100.000
	20.000		15.385	1.695	5.208	2.299	1.031	0.971	7.843	7.317	4.146
COLUMN SUMS	10	20	39	59	96	87	97	103	51	41	603
	1.658	3.317	6.468	9.784	15.920	14.428	16.086	17.081	8.458	6.799	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section C

Attitudes of Student Financial
Aid Administrators

TABLES 3-1 Through 3-10

"In Comparison to the Salaries in Other Institutions and to Salaries of Individuals Not Employed in Education, my Salary is Adequate"

Less than half of the respondents stated that their salaries were not adequate compared to salaries at other educational institutions and to the salaries of those not employed in education. Only 12.1 percent of the respondents expressed strong agreement with the adequacy of their salary compared to the salaries of individuals not employed at their institution (Table 3-1). Associate/Assistant Directors tended to express more dissatisfaction with their salaries than did respondents in other categories.

In general, respondents in all title categories tended to express more satisfaction with their salaries at public institutions than at private institutions. Among Directors of Financial Aid, respondents from proprietary institutions expressed the highest levels of satisfaction (Table 3-2). Responses from other title categories are shown in Tables 3-3, 3-4, and 3-5.

Respondents in all title categories were more likely to strongly agree that their salary was adequate as institutional size increased (Tables 3-6, 3-7, 3-8, 3-9).

Table 3-10 displays Directors' reactions to the adequacy of salary by institutional type, size, and control. Due to the limited number of respondents in the other title categories, responses of individuals who were not directors are not shown by institutional type, size, and control.

Table 3-1 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder- ately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	137 12.210 74.054	383 34.135 77.688	350 31.194 72.464	252 22.460 69.231	1122 100.000 73.574
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	16 10.191 8.649	41 26.115 8.316	43 27.389 8.903	57 36.306 15.659	157 100.000 10.295
FIN. AID OFFICER COUN/AD	17 11.111 9.189	44 28.758 8.925	58 37.908 12.008	34 22.222 9.341	153 100.000 10.011
OTHER	15 16.127 8.108	25 26.882 5.071	32 34.409 6.625	21 22.581 5.769	93 100.000 6.098
COLUMN SUMS	185 12.131 100.000	493 32.328 100.000	483 31.672 100.000	364 23.869 100.000	1525 100.000 100.000

Table 3-2 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions
by Institutional Control (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

INSTITUTIONAL					ROW SUMS
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
PUBLIC	71	169	124	108	472
	15.042	35.805	26.271	22.881	100.000
	51.825	44.591	15.423	43.200	42.294
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	47	173	204	110	554
	8.484	31.227	36.823	23.466	100.000
	34.307	45.646	59.286	52.000	49.642
PROPRI- ETARY	19	37	22	12	90
	21.111	41.111	24.444	13.333	100.000
	13.869	9.753	6.286	4.800	8.065
COLUMN SUMS	137	379	350	250	1116
	12.276	33.961	31.362	22.401	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
OUTSIDE?

Table 3-3 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions
by Institutional Control (Associate/Assistant Directors)

ASSOC./
 TITLE = ASSIS.
 DIRECT.

INSTITUTIONAL

ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:

COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
 OUTSIDE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	11	23	23	27	84
	13.095	27.381	27.381	32.143	100.000
	68.750	56.098	51.488	47.368	53.503
INDEP.	5	18	20	30	73
(PRI-	6.849	24.658	27.397	41.096	100.000
VATE)	31.250	43.902	46.512	52.632	46.497
PROPRI-					
ETARY					
COLUMN	16	41	43	57	157
SUMS	10.191	26.115	27.389	36.306	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-4 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

PIN.AID
TITLE = OFFICER
COUN/AD

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
OUTSIDE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	12	22	30	19	83
	14.458	26.506	36.145	22.892	100.000
	70.588	50.000	51.724	55.882	54.248
INDEP.	5	18	21	12	56
(PRI- VATE)	8.929	32.143	37.500	21.429	100.000
	29.412	40.909	36.207	35.294	36.601
PROPRI- ETARY		4	7	3	14
		28.571	50.000	21.429	100.000
		9.091	12.069	8.824	9.150
COLUMN SUMS	17	44	58	34	153
	11.111	28.758	37.908	22.222	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-5 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Control (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
OUTSIDE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	14	16	4	10	59
	23.729	27.119	32.203	16.949	100.000
	93.333	64.000	61.290	47.619	64.110
INDEP.	1	8	12	11	32
(PRI- VATE)	3.125	25.000	37.500	34.375	100.000
	6.667	32.000	38.710	52.381	34.783
PROPRI- ETARY		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		4.000			1.087
COLUMN SUMS	15	25	31	21	92
	16.304	27.174	33.696	22.826	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-6 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions
by Institutional Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
OUTSIDE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	32 9.786 23.529	101 30.887 26.509	119 36.391 34.097	75 22.936 29.880	327 100.000 29.275
1000-3999	37 9.920 27.206	122 32.708 32.021	117 31.367 33.524	97 26.005 38.645	373 100.000 33.393
4000-9999	36 17.062 26.471	67 31.754 17.585	63 29.858 18.052	45 21.327 17.924	211 100.000 18.890
10,000-19,999	19 14.394 13.971	56 42.424 14.698	35 26.515 10.029	22 16.667 8.765	132 100.000 11.817
20,000+	12 16.216 8.824	35 47.297 9.186	15 20.270 4.298	12 16.216 4.781	74 100.000 6.625
COLUMN SUMS	136 12.175 100.000	381 34.109 100.000	349 31.244 100.000	251 22.471 100.000	1117 100.000

Table 3-7 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other
Institutions by Institutional Size
(Associate/Assistant Directors)

TITLE = ASSOC./
ASSIS.
DIRECT.

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:
OUTSIDE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	1 6.667 6.250	4 26.667 9.756	4 26.667 9.524	6 40.000 10.714	15 100.000 9.677
1000-3999	1 3.704 6.250	6 22.222 14.634	6 22.222 14.286	14 51.852 25.000	27 100.000 17.419
4000-9999	3 8.824 18.750	7 20.588 17.071	11 32.353 26.190	13 38.235 23.214	34 100.000 21.935
10,000-19,999	4 12.500 25.000	12 37.500 29.268	7 21.875 16.667	9 28.125 16.071	32 100.000 20.645
20,000+	7 14.874 43.750	12 25.532 29.268	14 29.787 33.333	14 29.787 25.000	47 100.000 30.323
COLUMN SUMS	16 10.323 100.000	41 26.452 100.000	42 27.097 100.000	56 36.129 100.000	155 100.000

Table 3-8 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other
Institutions by Institutional Size
(Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

FIN.AID
TITLE = OFFICER
COUN/AD

INSTITUTIONAL		COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:				
ROWS = SIZE		OUTSIDE?				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER		3	8	14	14	39
1000		7.692	20.513	35.897	15.897	100.000
		17.647	18.182	24.138	41.176	25.490
1000-		4	15	22	9	50
1999		8.000	30.000	44.000	18.000	100.000
		23.529	34.091	37.931	26.471	32.680
4000-		2	8	8	2	20
9999		10.000	40.000	40.000	10.000	100.000
		11.765	18.182	13.793	5.882	13.072
10,000-		4	8	8	5	25
19,999		16.000	32.000	32.000	20.000	100.000
		23.529	18.182	13.793	14.706	16.340
20,000+		4	5	6	4	19
		21.053	26.316	31.579	21.053	100.000
		23.529	11.364	10.345	11.765	12.418
COLUMN		17	44	58	34	153
SUMS		11.111	28.758	37.908	22.222	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-9 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other
Institutions by Institutional Size (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

INSTITUTIONAL		COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE:				
ROWS = SIZE		OUTSIDE?				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER		1	2	4	6	13
1000		7.692	15.385	30.769	46.154	100.000
		6.667	8.000	12.903	28.571	14.130
1000-		2	10	12	6	30
1999		6.667	33.333	40.000	20.000	100.000
		13.333	40.000	18.710	28.571	32.609
4000-			1	6	6	13
9999			7.692	46.154	46.154	100.000
			4.000	19.355	28.571	14.130
10,000-		7	5	6	1	19
19,999		36.842	26.316	31.579	5.263	100.000
		46.667	20.000	19.355	4.762	20.652
20,000+		5	7	3	2	17
		29.412	41.176	17.647	11.765	100.000
		33.333	28.000	9.677	9.524	18.478
COLUMN		15	25	31	21	92
SUMS		16.304	27.174	33.696	22.826	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-10 Adequacy of Salary Compared to Other Institutions by Institutional Type, Control, and Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR					
ROWS - INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE		COLUMNS - SALARY ADEQUATE: OUTSIDE?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	15	25	22	22	84
4 YEAR*	17.857	29.762	26.190	26.190	100.000
<7000	11.278	6.739	6.433	1.016	7.706
PUBLIC	15	35	27	18	95
4 YEAR*	15.789	36.842	28.421	14.947	100.000
7-19999	11.278	9.434	7.895	7.377	8.716
PUBLIC	10	26	10	7	53
4 YEAR*	18.868	49.057	18.868	11.208	100.000
20,000+	7.519	7.008	2.924	2.869	4.862
PUBLIC	21	7	11	9	29
4 YEAR	6.997	24.138	37.931	31.034	100.000
<4000	1.504	1.887	1.216	3.689	2.661
PUBLIC	4	6	8	6	24
4 YEAR	16.667	25.000	33.333	25.000	100.000
4,000+	3.008	1.617	2.339	2.459	2.202
PUBLIC	4	21	21	20	66
2 YEAR	6.061	31.818	31.818	30.303	100.000
<4000	1.008	5.660	6.140	8.197	6.055
PUBLIC	14	32	13	13	72
2 YEAR	19.444	44.444	18.056	18.056	100.000
4,000+	10.526	8.625	1.801	5.328	6.606
PUBLIC, GRAD/ PROF		4	1	3	8
		50.000	12.500	37.500	100.000
		1.078	0.292	1.210	2.734
INDEP	7	33	18	26	104
4 YEAR*	6.731	31.731	36.538	25.000	100.000
<4000	5.263	8.895	11.111	10.656	9.541
INDEP	12	29	23	16	80
4 YEAR*	15.000	36.250	28.750	20.000	100.000
4,000+	9.023	7.817	6.725	6.557	7.339
INDEP	4	33	61	26	124
4 YEAR	3.226	26.613	49.194	20.968	100.000
<1000	3.008	8.895	17.836	10.656	11.376
INDEP	6	33	19	35	113
4 YEAR	5.310	29.204	34.513	30.973	100.000
1-1,999	4.511	8.895	11.404	14.344	10.367
INDEP	4	12	15	6	37
4 YEAR	10.811	32.432	40.541	16.216	100.000
2,000+	3.008	3.215	4.386	2.459	3.394
INDEP	5	12	13	11	41
2 YEAR	12.195	29.268	31.707	26.829	100.000
	3.759	3.235	3.801	4.508	3.761
INDEP GRAD/ PROF	2	12	4	7	25
	8.000	48.000	16.000	28.000	100.000
	1.504	3.235	1.170	2.869	2.294
PUBLIC	4	5	2		11
INDEP	36.364	45.455	18.182		100.000
NURSING	1.008	1.348	0.585		1.009
PUBLIC	6	9	12	7	34
INDEP	17.647	26.471	35.294	20.548	100.000
VOC.TEC	4.511	2.426	3.509	2.869	3.119
PROPRI.	17	23	10	7	57
VOC.TEC	29.825	40.351	17.544	12.281	100.000
	17.782	6.199	2.924	2.869	5.229
ALL	2	14	12	5	33
OTHER	6.061	42.424	36.364	15.152	100.000
PROPRI.	1.504	3.774	3.503	2.049	3.028
COLUMN SUMS	133	371	342	244	1090
	12.202	34.037	31.376	22.385	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 3-11 Through 3-20 "In Comparison to the Salaries of Others in my Institution, my Salary is Adequate"

As shown in Table 3-11, respondents were more likely to agree that their salaries were adequate compared to salaries within their institution (55.0%) as opposed to salaries outside of their institution (44.5%) as shown in Table 3-1. As in Table 3-1, Associate/Assistant Directors expressed a higher level of dissatisfaction with their salaries than did other respondents.

There was a slight tendency for respondents from independent institutions to agree more readily than those from public institutions that their salary was adequate compared with others in their institution. Directors of Financial Aid at proprietary institutions expressed the greatest level of satisfaction, with approximately two-thirds of them agreeing that their salary was adequate (Table 3-2; also see Tables 3-12, 3-13, 3-14, and 3-15).

There were no differences (at the .05 level) between satisfaction with salary and institutional size within each title category. This is not to say, however, that there are no differences based upon size (Tables 3-16, 3-17, 3-18, and 3-19).

Table 3-20 shows Directors' reactions to the adequacy of salary by institutional type, size, and control.

Table 3-11 Adequacy of Salary Within
the Institution by Title

ROWS = TITLE		SALARY ADEQUATE COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?			
		STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder- ately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE
					ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR		220	429	313	162
		19.573	38.167	27.847	14.413
		78.953	76.335	71.298	65.323
ASSOCIATE/ASSISTANT DIRECTOR		19	48	50	40
		12.102	30.573	31.847	25.478
		6.810	8.541	11.390	16.129
FINANCIAL AID OFFICER		21	58	49	26
		11.636	37.662	11.819	16.883
		7.527	10.320	11.162	10.484
OTHER		19	27	27	20
		20.430	29.032	29.032	21.505
		6.810	4.804	6.150	8.065
COLUMN SUMS		279	567	439	248
		18.259	36.780	28.730	16.230
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-12 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution
by Institutional Control (Directors)

TITLE = DIREC-
TOP

INSTITUTIONAL		SALARY ADEQUATE			
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:		COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	85	163	136	89	473
	17.970	34.461	28.753	18.816	100.000
	38.813	38.353	43.590	54.938	42.308
INDEP.	107	230	156	63	556
(PRI-	19.245	41.367	28.058	11.331	100.000
VATF)	48.858	54.118	50.000	38.889	49.732
PROPRI-	27	32	20	10	89
ETARY	30.337	35.955	22.472	11.236	100.000
	12.329	7.529	6.410	6.173	7.961
COLUMN	219	425	312	162	1118
SUMS	19.589	38.014	27.907	14.490	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-13 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by
Institutional Control (Associate/Assistant Directors)

TITLE = ASSOC./
ASSIS.
DIRECT.

INSTITUTIONAL		SALARY ADEQUATE			
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:		COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	11	21	26	24	84
	13.095	27.381	30.952	28.571	100.000
	57.895	47.917	52.000	60.000	53.503
INDEP.	8	25	24	16	73
(PRI-	10.959	34.247	32.877	21.918	100.000
VATF)	42.105	52.083	48.000	40.000	46.497
PROPRI-					
ETARY					
COLUMN	19	48	50	40	157
SUMS	12.102	30.573	31.847	25.478	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-14 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

FIN. AID
TITLE = OFFICER
COUN/AD

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:

SALARY ADEQUATE
COLUMNS = WITHIN
INSTITUTION?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	9	27	29	20	85
	10.588	31.765	34.118	23.529	100.000
	42.857	46.552	59.184	76.923	55.195
INDEP. {PRI- VATE}	11	25	15	5	56
	19.643	44.643	26.786	8.929	100.000
	52.381	43.103	30.612	19.231	36.364
PROPRI- ETARY	1	6	5	1	13
	7.592	46.154	39.462	7.692	100.000
	4.762	10.345	10.204	3.846	8.442
COLUMN SUMS	21	58	49	26	154
	13.635	37.662	31.818	16.883	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-15 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Control (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

INSTITUTIONAL		SALARY ADEQUATE			
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:		COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	13	12	22	13	60
	21.667	20.000	36.667	21.667	100.000
	68.421	44.444	44.615	65.000	65.217
INDEP.	6	14	4	7	31
{PRI- VATE}	19.355	45.161	12.903	22.581	100.000
	31.579	51.852	15.385	35.000	33.696
PROPRI- ETARY		1			1
		100.000			100.000
		3.704			1.047
COLUMN SUMS	19	27	26	20	92
	20.652	29.348	24.261	21.739	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-16 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution
by Institutional Size (Directors)

TITLE = DIRECTOR					
INSTITUTIONAL			SALARY ADEQUATE		
ROWS = SIZE			COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?		
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER	75	124	90	39	328
1000	22.866	37.805	27.439	11.890	100.000
	14.247	24.176	28.754	24.074	29.312
1000-	60	144	112	60	376
9999	15.957	38.298	29.787	15.957	100.000
	27.397	33.882	35.783	37.037	33.601
10000-	42	74	56	38	210
9999	20.000	35.238	26.667	18.095	100.000
	19.178	17.412	17.891	23.457	18.767
10,000-	27	57	31	16	131
19,999	20.611	43.511	23.664	12.214	100.000
	12.329	13.412	4.904	9.877	11.707
20,000+	15	26	24	9	74
	20.270	35.135	32.432	12.162	100.000
	6.849	6.118	7.668	5.556	6.613
COLUMN SUMS	219	425	313	162	1119
	19.571	37.980	27.971	14.477	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 3-17 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by
Institutional Size (Associate/Assistant Directors)

ASSOC./
TITLE = ASSIS.
DIRECT.

INSTITUTIONAL		SALARY ADEQUATE				
ROWS - SIZE	COLUMNS = WITHIN					INSTITUTION?
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
UNDER 1000	2	6	6	1	15	
	11.333	40.000	40.000	6.667	100.000	
	10.526	12.766	12.000	2.564	9.677	
1000- 9999	4	6	6	11	27	
	14.815	22.222	22.222	40.741	100.000	
	21.053	12.766	12.000	28.205	17.419	
10000- 9999	2	11	16	5	34	
	5.882	32.351	47.059	14.706	100.000	
	10.526	23.404	32.000	12.821	21.935	
10,000- 19,999	5	12	6	9	32	
	15.625	37.500	18.750	28.125	100.000	
	26.316	25.532	12.000	23.077	20.645	
20,000+	6	12	16	13	47	
	12.766	25.532	34.041	27.660	100.000	
	31.579	25.532	32.000	33.333	10.323	
COLUMN SUMS	19	47	50	39	155	
	12.258	30.323	32.258	25.161	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 3-18 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution
by Institutional Size (Financial Aid
Officers/Counselors/Advisors)

PIN. AID

TITLE = OFFICER

COUN/AD

INSTITUTIONAL		SALARY ADEQUATE				
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = WITHIN INSTITUTION?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE		ROW SUMS
UNDER	6	15	10	7		38
1000	15.789	39.474	26.316	18.421	100.000	
	28.571	25.862	20.833	26.923		24.837
1000-	4	22	17	8		51
3999	7.843	43.137	33.333	15.686	100.000	
	19.048	37.931	35.417	30.769		33.333
4000-	2	9	7	2		20
9999	10.000	45.000	35.000	10.000	100.000	
	9.524	15.517	14.583	7.642		13.072
10,000-	5	5	8	7		25
19,999	20.000	20.000	32.000	28.000	100.000	
	23.810	8.621	16.667	26.923		16.340
20,000+	4	7	6	2		19
	21.053	36.842	31.579	10.526	100.000	
	19.048	12.069	12.500	7.692		12.418
COLUMN	21	58	48	26		153
SUMS	13.725	37.908	31.373	15.993	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000

Table 3-19 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution
by Institutional Size (Other)

TITLE = OTHER

INSTITUTIONAL

ROWS = SIZE

SALARY ADEQUATE

COLUMNS = WITHIN

INSTITUTION?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER	3	4	1	5	13
1000	23.077	30.769	7.692	38.462	100.000
	15.789	14.815	3.846	25.000	14.130
1000-	6	9	9	7	31
3999	19.355	29.032	29.032	22.581	100.000
	31.579	31.333	34.615	35.000	33.696
4000-		6	4	3	13
9999		46.154	30.769	23.077	100.000
		22.222	15.385	15.000	14.130
10,000-	6	4	7	1	18
19,999	33.333	22.222	38.889	5.556	100.000
	31.579	14.815	26.923	5.000	19.565
20,000+	4	4	5	4	17
	23.529	23.529	29.412	23.529	100.000
	21.053	14.815	19.211	20.000	18.478
COLUMN SUMS	19 20.652 100.000	27 29.348 100.000	26 28.261 100.000	20 21.739 100.000	92 100.000 100.000

Table 3-20 Adequacy of Salary Within the Institution by Institutional Type, Control, and Size (Directors)

TITLE - DIRECTOR

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SALARY ADEQUATE WITHIN INSTITUTION?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	18	28	21	17	84
4 YEAR*	21.429	33.333	25.000	20.238	100.000
<7000	8.531	6.711	6.840	10.625	7.678
PUBLIC	17	34	28	16	95
4 YEAR*	17.995	35.789	23.474	16.842	100.000
7-19999	8.007	8.173	9.121	10.000	8.684
PUBLIC	11	21	14	7	53
4 YEAR*	20.755	39.623	26.415	13.208	100.000
20,000+	5.213	5.048	4.560	4.375	4.845
PUBLIC*	2	6	13	9	30
4 YEAR	6.667	20.000	43.333	30.000	100.000
<4000	0.948	1.442	4.235	5.625	2.742
PUBLIC	4	8	8	4	24
4 YEAR	16.667	33.333	33.333	16.667	100.000
4,000+	1.876	1.923	2.606	2.500	2.194
PUBLIC	8	25	17	18	68
2 YEAR	11.765	36.765	25.000	26.471	100.000
<4000	3.791	6.010	5.537	11.250	6.216
PUBLIC	17	21	21	12	71
2 YEAR	23.944	29.577	29.577	16.901	100.000
4,000+	4.057	5.048	6.840	7.500	6.490
PUBLIC,		2	4	2	8
GRAD/		25.000	50.000	25.000	100.000
PROF		0.481	1.303	1.250	0.731
INDEP	18	50	23	14	105
4 YEAR*	17.143	47.619	21.905	13.333	100.000
<4000	8.531	12.019	7.492	8.750	9.578
INDEP	17	36	19	8	80
4 YEAR*	21.250	45.000	23.750	10.000	100.000
4,000+	8.057	8.654	6.189	5.000	7.313
INDEP	26	45	39	14	124
4 YEAR	20.968	36.290	31.452	11.290	100.000
<1000	12.322	10.817	12.704	8.750	11.335
INDEP	13	44	41	16	114
4 YEAR	11.404	38.596	35.965	14.035	100.000
1-1,999	6.111	10.577	13.355	10.000	10.420
INDEP	7	17	10	3	37
4 YEAR	18.919	45.946	27.027	8.100	100.000
2,000+	3.314	4.087	3.257	1.875	3.382
INDEP	9	14	14	4	41
2 YEAR	21.951	34.146	34.146	9.756	100.000
	4.265	3.365	4.560	2.500	3.748
INDEP	8	11	3	4	26
GRAD/	30.769	42.308	11.538	15.385	100.000
PROF	1.791	2.644	0.977	2.500	2.377
PUBLIC*	1	6	2		11
INDEP	27.273	54.545	18.182		100.000
NURSING	1.422	1.442	0.651		1.005
PUBLIC*	6	16	10	2	34
INDEP	17.647	47.059	29.412	5.882	100.000
VOC.TEC	2.884	3.846	3.257	1.250	3.108
PROPRI.	19	15	15	6	55
VOC.TEC	14.545	27.273	27.273	10.409	100.000
	9.095	3.606	4.886	3.750	5.027
ALL	8	17	5	4	34
OTHER	23.529	50.000	14.706	11.765	100.000
PROPRI.	1.791	4.087	1.629	2.500	3.108
COLUMN	211	416	307	160	1094
SUMS	19.287	38.026	28.062	14.625	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 4-1 Through 4-4 "I Have Enough Authority to do my Job Effectively"

Over 93 percent of the respondents agreed, either strongly or moderately, that they had enough authority to do their job effectively. Directors of financial aid were most likely to express "strong" agreement that they had enough authority to do their job effectively (Table 4-1).

At least 90 percent of the respondents in most of the major categories agreed that they had sufficient authority. However, there are a number of statistically significant differences (at the .01 level) based upon institutional control, size, and "number of years of employment in the financial aid profession." For example, 71.3 percent of the respondents from proprietary institutions expressed strong agreement that they had sufficient authority, while the percentage expressing strong agreement from public institutions was considerably less (Table 4-2). As shown in Table 4-3, the percentage of respondents expressing strong agreement that they have sufficient authority decreases from 63.5 percent to 51.4 percent as institutional size increases from under 1,000 to over 20,000.

As length of employment increases, the tendency for respondents to strongly agree that they have sufficient authority also increases (Table 4-4).

Table 4-1 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively by Title

ROWS - TITLE	COLUMNS - SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- ATELY DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	87	860	95	16	1338
	62.169	33.141	3.292	1.153	100.000
	73.747	69.637	52.191	40.000	71.375
ASSOCIATE	13	64	14	10	166
	43.476	41.566	4.430	6.020	100.000
DIRECTOR	6.610	10.055	16.471	25.000	8.892
FINANCIAL	85	79	13	8	146
OFFICER	45.619	42.473	7.527	4.101	100.000
COUNSEL	7.723	11.470	16.471	20.000	9.862
OTHER	74	52	12	6	146
	52.055	35.616	3.214	4.110	100.000
	6.003	7.479	14.114	15.000	7.741
COLUMNS	1101	660	45	40	1496
SUMS	59.474	34.995	4.507	2.121	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-2 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively
by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL					ROW SUMS
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:				COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
PUBLIC	435	296	45	22	798
	54.511	37.093	5.639	2.757	100.000
	39.617	44.848	52.326	55.000	42.357
INDEP.	556	325	38	17	936
(PRI-	59.402	34.722	4.060	1.816	100.000
VATE)	50.638	49.242	44.186	42.500	49.682
PROPRI-	107	39	3	1	150
ETARY	71.333	26.000	2.000	0.667	100.000
	9.745	5.909	3.488	2.500	7.962
COLUMN	1098	660	86	40	1884
SUMS	58.280	35.032	4.565	2.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-3 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively
by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL					ROW SUMS
ROWS = SIZE				COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
UNDER	388	195	20	8	611
1000	61.502	31.915	3.273	1.309	100.000
	15.273	29.635	23.256	20.000	32.431
1000-	333	186	29	8	556
3999	59.492	33.453	5.216	1.439	100.000
	10.273	28.267	33.721	20.000	29.512
4000-	166	118	16	6	306
9999	54.244	38.562	5.229	1.961	100.000
	15.091	17.933	18.695	15.000	16.242
10,000-	123	91	11	10	235
19,999	52.340	38.723	4.681	4.255	100.000
	11.182	13.830	12.791	25.000	12.473
20,000+	70	68	10	8	176
	51.136	38.636	5.682	4.545	100.000
	8.182	10.334	11.620	20.000	9.342
COLUMN	1100	658	86	40	1884
SUMS	58.386	34.926	4.565	2.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-4 Sufficient Authority to do Job Effectively
by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder. Dis- agree	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	128 49.612 11.615	113 41.798 17.121	13 5.039 15.116	4 1.550 10.000	258 100.000 11.665
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	176 50.867 15.971	119 40.173 21.061	21 6.069 24.419	10 2.840 25.000	346 100.000 18.326
4-5 YEARS	223 59.626 20.236	128 34.225 19.394	10 2.674 11.628	13 3.476 32.500	374 100.000 19.809
6-10 YEARS	360 59.406 32.668	204 33.663 30.909	31 5.116 36.047	11 1.815 27.500	606 100.000 2.097
11-15 YEARS	171 70.954 15.517	60 24.896 9.091	8 3.320 9.302	2 0.810 5.000	241 10.000 1.765
16+ YEARS	44 69.841 3.993	16 25.397 2.424	3 4.762 3.488		63 100.000 3.337
COLUMN SUMS	1102 58.369 100.000	660 34.958 100.000	86 4.555 100.000	40 2.119 100.000	1888 100.000 100.000

TABLES 4-5 Through 4-7 "My Superiors Have a Clear Picture of the Kind of Job I am Doing in Financial Aid Administration"

78.3 percent of the respondents regarded their superiors as having a clear picture of the kind of work they were doing in the financial aid office. However, there are significant differences (at the .05 level) between various categories of respondents. The categories of "Associate/Assistant Director" and "Financial Aid Officer/Counselor/Advisor" had the highest levels of dissatisfaction with their superiors' knowledge of the kind of job they were doing (Table 4-5).

Reactions to superiors' knowledge of the kind of job being done by respondents varied by institutional type and size (Table 4-6). The respondents who most strongly agreed that their superiors had a clear picture of the kind of work being done by the respondent were from independent universities with enrollments of over 4,000 students and from proprietary institutions. Respondents from the following types of institutions had the greatest tendency to disagree (either strongly or moderately) that their superiors had a clear picture of the work being done by the respondents:

1. 2-year public colleges with enrollments of 4,000 and over (32.5%)
2. 4-year independent colleges with enrollments of 2,000 and over (32.7%)
3. Nursing Schools (40.0%)

There is a statistically significant relationship (at the .01 level) between greater understanding of the respondents' performance by superiors and longer length of employment in the financial aid profession. For example, for those with 5 or less years of experience, less than one-third strongly agree that their supervisors understand the kind of work being done by the respondent. For those employed in financial aid 11-15 years, the figure moves up to 43.1 percent and for those employed 16 years or more the figure equals 50 percent (Table 4-7).

Table 4-5 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of Job Done by Title

ROW	TITLE	SUPERIORS UNDERSTAND PERFORMANCE?				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODIF- ATELY AGREE	MODER- ATELY DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DEPT- TOP		46.7	62.1	185	89	1382
		15.233	44.935	11.386	6.440	100.000
		75.671	74.910	69.411	62.239	73.472
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.		5.1	5.0	27	22	166
		15.542	14.940	16.265	13.253	100.000
		9.161	6.996	10.189	15.185	8.825
FIN. AID OFFICER/ COUNSELOR/ ADV.		5.1	8.2	32	21	188
		20.191	43.617	17.021	11.170	100.000
		8.230	9.491	12.075	10.685	9.995
OTHER		4.5	6.8	21	11	145
		11.039	46.897	14.483	7.586	100.000
		6.068	8.293	7.925	7.692	7.709
TOTAL SHE.		644	829	265	143	1881
		34.247	44.072	14.098	7.602	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-6 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of Job Done
by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS =		INSTITUTIONAL			COLUMNS =	
		TYPE AND SIZE			SUPERIORS	
					UNDERSTAND	
					PERFORMANCE?	
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		35	48	15	9	107
4 YEAR+		32.713	44.860	14.019	8.411	100.000
<7000		5.654	5.941	5.725	6.383	5.847
PUBLIC		43	63	20	11	137
4 YEAR+		31.387	45.985	14.599	8.029	100.000
7-19999		6.947	7.797	7.634	7.801	7.486
PUBLIC		40	57	13	9	119
4 YEAR+		33.613	47.899	10.924	7.563	100.000
20,000+		6.462	7.054	4.962	6.383	6.503
PUBLIC		14	15	8	3	40
4 YEAR		35.000	37.500	20.000	7.500	100.000
<4000		2.262	1.856	1.053	2.120	2.186
PUBLIC		10	12	4	3	29
4 YEAR		34.483	41.379	13.793	10.345	100.000
4,000+		1.616	1.485	1.527	2.120	1.585
PUBLIC		36	54	20	9	119
2 YEAR		30.252	45.378	16.807	7.563	100.000
<4000		5.816	6.683	7.634	6.383	6.503
PUBLIC		28	53	23	16	120
2 YEAR		23.333	44.167	19.167	13.333	100.000
4,000+		4.523	6.559	8.779	11.348	6.557
PUBLIC		12	17	4	3	36
GRAD/ PROF		33.333	47.222	11.111	8.333	100.000
		1.939	2.104	1.527	2.128	1.967
INDEP		50	84	17	11	162
4 YEAR+		30.864	51.852	10.494	6.790	100.000
<4000		8.078	10.396	6.489	7.801	8.852
INDEP		68	51	21	9	149
4 YEAR+		45.638	34.228	14.094	6.040	100.000
4,000+		10.985	6.312	8.015	6.383	8.142
INDEP		53	90	27	13	183
4 YEAR		28.962	49.180	14.754	7.104	100.000
<1000		8.562	11.139	10.305	9.220	10.000
INDEP		46	66	19	9	140
4 YEAR		32.857	47.143	13.571	6.429	100.000
1-1,999		7.431	8.168	7.252	6.383	7.650
INDEP		16	21	12	6	55
4 YEAR		29.091	38.102	21.818	10.909	100.000
2,000+		2.585	2.599	4.580	4.255	3.005
INDEP		27	33	8	5	73
2 YEAR		36.986	45.205	10.959	6.849	100.000
		4.162	4.084	3.053	3.546	3.989
INDEP		42	43	13	9	107
GPAD/ PROF		39.252	40.187	12.150	8.411	100.000
		6.785	5.322	4.962	6.383	5.847
PUBLIC		8	13	11	3	35
INDEP		22.857	37.143	31.429	8.571	100.000
NURSING		1.292	1.609	4.198	2.128	1.913
PUBLIC		20	37	11	6	74
INDEP		27.027	50.000	14.865	8.108	100.000
VOC.TEC		3.231	4.579	4.198	4.255	4.044
PROPRI.		47	26	8	6	87
VOC.TEC		54.023	29.885	9.195	6.897	100.000
		7.593	3.218	3.053	4.255	4.754
ALL		24	25	8	1	58
OTHER		41.379	43.103	13.793	1.724	100.000
PROPRI.		3.377	3.094	3.053	0.709	3.169
COLUMN		619	808	262	141	1830
SUMS		33.825	44.153	14.317	7.705	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-7 Superiors Have a Clear Picture of
Job Done by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = SUPERIORS UNDERSTAND PERFORMANCE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER- ately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	78 30.588 12.093	126 49.412 15.236	33 12.941 12.313	18 7.059 12.587	255 100.000 13.542
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	113 32.471 17.519	132 37.931 15.961	71 29.402 26.493	32 9.195 22.378	348 100.000 18.481
4-5 YEARS	113 30.295 17.519	177 47.453 21.403	56 15.013 20.896	27 7.239 18.881	373 100.000 19.809
6-10 YEARS	206 34.106 31.939	271 44.868 32.769	76 12.583 29.158	51 8.444 35.664	604 100.000 32.076
11-15 YEARS	104 43.154 16.124	95 39.419 11.487	29 12.033 10.821	13 5.394 9.091	241 100.000 12.799
16+ YEARS	31 50.000 4.806	26 41.935 3.144	3 4.839 1.119	2 3.226 1.399	62 100.000 3.293
COLUMN SUMS	645 34.254 100.000	827 43.919 100.000	268 14.213 100.000	143 7.594 100.000	1883 100.000 100.000

TABLES 4-8 Through 4-11 "I am Recognized by Others in my Institution
as Holding an Important Position"

As shown in Table 4-8, almost 80 percent of the respondents agreed (moderately or strongly) that they were recognized by others as holding an important position. However, there are statistically significant differences (at the .01 level) in the responses to this question depending upon title. Although 83.9 percent of Directors agreed that they were recognized by others as holding an important position, only 59.3 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors, and 70.1 percent of Financial Aid Officers/Counselors/Advisors expressed the same opinion. Directors were over twice as likely to strongly agree that they were recognized as holding an important position as Associate/Assistant Directors. Over 40 percent of the Associate/Assistant Directors did not believe that others recognized them as holding an important position.

As the percentage of employment time devoted to financial aid decreased, respondents were more likely to strongly agree (Table 4-9) that they were recognized by others in their institution as holding an important position (significant at the .01 level):

Percentage of time in financial aid:	Percentage expressing strong agreement relating to recognition by others:
100%	26.4%
50% or less	47.8%

For a summary of the kinds of job responsibilities held by financial aid administrators external to the Financial Aid Office, see Table 1-17.

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) between perceived recognition as holding an important position and institutional control and type. Over 55 percent of the respondents from proprietary institutions strongly believed that they were recognized as holding an important position. Less than one-third of the respondents from independent institutions were in the "strongly agree" category, while less than one-fourth of the respondents from public institutions were in this category (Table 4-10).

As shown in Table 4-11, respondents from 2-year institutions showed the least tendency (26.3%) to strongly agree that they were recognized as holding an important position while those at vocational/technical schools showed the greatest incidence of strong agreement (48.1%).

Table 4-8 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.) ?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	467	682	167	54	1370
	14.000	49.781	12.190	3.942	100.000
	80.916	75.193	61.397	54.000	73.815
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.	25	71	52	14	162
	15.432	43.827	32.099	8.642	100.000
	4.333	7.428	11.118	14.000	8.728
FIN. AID OFFICER COUN/AD	43	86	34	21	184
	21.170	46.739	18.478	11.413	100.000
	7.452	9.482	12.500	21.000	9.914
OTHER	42	68	19	11	140
	30.000	48.571	13.571	7.857	100.000
	7.279	7.497	6.985	11.000	7.543
COLUMN SUMS	577	907	272	100	1856
	31.000	48.869	14.655	5.388	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-9 Recognized by Others - Holding an Important Position by Percentage of Employment Time in Financial Aid

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID		COLUMNS = IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.) ?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER- ately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
100%	290	537	121	70	1044
	28.438	49.519	17.620	6.458	100.000
	49.110	59.076	73.221	69.107	58.217
75-99%	111	184	51	17	363
	30.579	50.639	14.050	4.683	100.000
	13.119	20.242	18.750	16.332	19.495
50-74%	73	69	18	5	165
	39.459	48.108	9.730	2.701	100.000
	12.536	9.771	6.618	4.950	9.916
LESS THAN HALF	110	99	12	9	230
	47.826	41.043	5.217	3.911	100.000
	18.966	10.891	4.412	8.911	12.352
COLUMN SUMS	580	939	272	101	1862
	31.142	48.818	14.608	5.424	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-10 Recognized by Others - Holding
an Important Position by
Institutional Control

ROWS =	INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION:				IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.) ?
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
PUBLIC	194	406	140	55	795
	24.403	51.069	17.610	6.918	100.000
	33.798	44.714	51.471	54.455	42.857
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	299	442	126	46	913
	32.749	48.412	13.801	5.038	100.000
	52.091	48.678	46.324	45.545	49.218
PROPRI- ETARY	81	60	6		147
	55.102	40.816	4.082		100.000
	14.111	6.608	2.206		7.925
COLUMN SUMS	574	908	272	101	1855
	30.943	48.949	14.663	5.445	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-11 Recognized by Others - Holding
an Important Position by
Institutional Type

ROWS =	INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:				IMPORTANT POSITION (OTHERS RECOG.) ?
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
VOC. TECH.	77	69	8	6	160
	48.125	43.125	5.000	3.750	100.000
	13.775	7.814	3.008	6.000	8.850
2 YEARS 6 UNDER NOT V.T.	93	183	53	24	353
	26.346	51.841	15.014	6.799	100.000
	16.637	20.725	19.925	24.000	19.524
4 YEAR	126	227	78	16	447
	28.188	50.783	17.450	3.579	100.000
	22.540	25.708	29.323	16.000	24.723
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	192	330	198	40	670
	28.657	49.254	16.119	5.970	100.000
	34.347	37.373	40.602	40.000	37.058
NURSING	16	16	5	3	40
	40.000	40.000	12.500	7.500	100.000
	2.862	1.812	1.800	3.000	2.212
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	55	58	14	11	138
	39.855	42.029	10.145	7.971	100.000
	9.839	6.569	5.263	11.000	7.633
COLUMN SUMS	559	883	266	100	1808
	30.918	48.838	14.712	5.531	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 4-12 Through 4-16 "Financial Aid Work is Sufficiently Satisfying to be a Lifetime Career for Me"

A total of 69.2 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that the financial aid profession was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-12). A majority of the respondents (60.3%) under 25 stated that the financial aid profession was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-13), and this percentage increased to 80 percent in the group aged 60 and over (significant at the .01 level). A related finding is that the attractiveness of the financial aid profession increases as length of employment in financial aid increases. Ninety percent of the respondents who have worked 16 or more years in the financial aid profession find it sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career. It is interesting to note, however, that over 60 percent of the respondents with one year or less experience agree that the financial aid profession is sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career (Table 4-14).

There are few differences in financial aid as a career choice based upon institutional control (public, independent, proprietary) and institutional size. However, there are a number of differences based upon institutional type. Over 70 percent of the respondents in three of the institutional type categories agreed that financial aid work was sufficiently satisfying to be a lifetime career. Although Nursing Schools had the highest percentage of respondents who "strongly agreed," respondents from Nursing Schools and Graduate/Professional Schools also had the highest percentages of respondents who were less likely to see the financial aid profession as their lifetime career (Table 4-15).

As shown in Table 4-16, female respondents were more likely to view financial aid as a career than were men (significant at the .01 level). There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) by racial/ethnic group.

Table 4-12 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Title

ROWS = TITLE	COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?				
	NEITHER LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- ATELY DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	907	536	263	121	1322
TOTAL	10,556	40,240	27,120	9,044	100,000
	76,975	74,860	73,626	62,644	73,673
ASSOCIATE	53	62	26	20	161
ADMINISTRATIVE	12,113	34,509	16,149	12,422	100,000
DEVELOPMENT	9,007	8,659	7,143	10,363	8,905
FINANCIAL AID	43	73	43	26	187
OFFICE	29,364	39,037	22,975	13,904	100,000
COORDINATOR	4,111	10,196	11,813	13,472	10,343
OTHER	50	45	27	26	128
	23,138	35,156	21,094	20,413	100,000
	5,637	6,285	7,418	13,472	7,080
COLUMBIA	535	716	364	193	1808
SUMS	23,591	39,602	29,133	19,675	100,000
	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000

Table 4-13 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Age

ROWS = AGE

COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID
AS A CAREER?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 25	25	48	32	16	121
	20.661	39.669	26.446	13.223	100.000
	4.673	6.723	8.791	8.247	6.696
26-30	78	143	101	48	370
	21.081	38.649	27.297	12.973	100.000
	14.579	20.028	27.747	24.742	20.476
31-35	77	143	89	41	350
	22.000	40.857	25.429	11.714	100.000
	14.393	20.028	24.451	21.134	19.369
36-40	78	114	45	27	264
	21.545	43.182	17.045	10.227	100.000
	11.579	15.966	12.363	13.918	14.610
41-50	127	149	57	29	362
	35.083	41.160	15.746	8.011	100.000
	23.739	20.868	15.659	14.948	20.033
51-59	111	96	31	27	265
	41.887	16.226	11.698	10.189	100.000
	20.748	13.445	8.516	13.918	14.665
60+	39	21	9	6	75
	52.000	28.000	12.000	8.000	100.000
	7.290	2.941	2.473	3.093	4.151
COL SUMS	535	714	364	194	1807
	29.607	39.513	20.144	10.736	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-14 Financial Aid as a Career Choice
by Years WorkedROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN
FINANCIAL AIDCOLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID
AS A CAREER?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	54	96	58	38	246
	21.951	39.024	23.577	15.447	100.000
	10.056	13.445	15.934	19.487	13.591
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	73	118	93	48	332
	21.908	35.542	28.012	14.458	100.000
	13.594	16.527	25.589	24.615	18.343
4-5 YEARS	98	137	90	40	355
	24.789	38.592	25.352	11.268	100.000
	16.387	19.188	24.725	20.513	19.613
6-10 YEARS	193	245	90	54	582
	33.162	42.096	15.464	9.278	100.000
	35.440	34.314	24.725	27.692	32.155
11-15 YEARS	96	97	29	13	235
	40.851	41.277	12.340	5.532	100.000
	17.877	13.585	7.967	6.667	12.983
16+ YEARS	31	21	4	2	60
	55.000	35.000	6.667	3.333	100.000
	6.145	2.441	1.099	1.026	3.315
COL SUMS	537	714	364	195	1810
	29.669	39.448	20.110	10.773	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-15 Financial Aid as a Career Choice
by Institutional Type

INSTITUTIONAL					
ROWS = TYPE:		COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREER?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC.	47	63	33	13	156
TFCN.	30.129	40.385	21.154	8.333	100.000
	9.182	9.013	9.270	6.878	8.884
2 YEARS	87	134	88	16	345
6 UNDER	25.217	38.841	25.507	10.435	100.000
NOT V.T.	16.492	19.170	24.719	19.048	19.647
4 YEAR	139	187	80	12	438
	31.735	42.694	18.265	7.306	100.000
	27.148	26.753	22.472	16.931	24.943
4 YEAR AND	206	271	111	62	650
	31.692	41.692	17.077	9.538	100.000
BEYOND	40.234	38.770	31.180	32.804	37.016
NURSING	12	8	8	6	34
	35.294	23.529	23.529	17.647	100.000
	2.344	1.144	2.247	3.175	1.936
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	21	36	36	40	133
	15.789	27.068	27.068	30.075	100.000
	4.102	5.150	10.112	21.164	7.574
COLUMN SUMS	512	699	356	189	1756
	29.157	39.806	20.273	10.763	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 4-16 Financial Aid as a Career Choice by Sex

ROWS = SEX				COLUMNS = FINANCIAL AID AS A CAREPR?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
MALE	304 26.855 56.611	464 40.989 65.077	246 21.731 67.769	118 10.424 62.105	1132 100.000 62.784
FEMALE	233 34.724 41.389	249 37.109 34.923	117 17.437 32.231	72 10.730 37.895	671 100.000 37.216
COLUMN SUMS	537 29.784 100.000	713 39.545 100.000	363 20.133 100.000	190 10.538 100.000	1803 100.000 100.000

TABLES 5-1 Through 5-3

"Communications from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations are Generally Adequate to Keep me Up to Date with Changes in Legislation, Regulations, and with Current Issues in Financial Aid"

As shown in Table 5-1, over 85 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that communications from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations were adequate to keep them informed about current issues in financial aid. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in the responses by title, institutional type, or by years worked in financial aid. This latter finding is interesting in the sense that present communiques are seen as meaningful by financial aid administrators with experience ranging from less than one year to over 16 years (Table 5-2).

Institutional size had a significant effect (at the .01 level) on the perceived adequacy of communiques from NASFAA and Regional SFA Associations. In general, as institutional size increased, respondents were less likely to find NASFAA and regional communiques adequate to keep them up to date. However, even among respondents from the largest institutions (20,000 students and over), 78.1 percent found the present communications efforts to be adequate (Table 5-3).

Table 5-1 Adequacy of Communications by Title

ROWS = TITLE		NASFAA & SFA COLUMNS = COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	477 35.281 75.714	686 50.740 73.605	155 11.464 77.500	34 2.515 72.340	1352 100.000 74.737	
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.	52 32.500 8.254	90 56.250 9.657	15 9.375 7.500	3 1.875 6.383	160 100.000 8.845	
FIN. AID OFFICER/ COUN/AD	63 35.795 10.000	94 53.409 10.086	16 9.091 8.000	3 1.705 6.383	176 100.000 9.729	
OTHER	38 31.405 6.032	62 51.240 6.652	14 11.570 7.000	7 5.705 14.894	121 100.000 6.689	
COLUMN SUMS	630 34.826 100.000	932 51.520 100.000	200 11.056 100.000	47 2.598 100.000	1809 100.000 100.000	

Table 5-2 Adequacy of Communications by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = NASFAA & SFA COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	83 35.470 11.175	133 56.838 14.255	11 4.701 5.473	7 2.991 14.894	234 100.000 12.921
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	114 34.756 18.095	167 50.915 17.899	40 12.195 19.900	7 2.134 14.894	328 100.000 18.112
4-5 YEARS	135 37.098 21.429	195 50.824 19.829	36 9.890 17.910	8 2.198 17.021	364 100.000 20.099
6-10 YEARS	204 34.694 12.181	288 48.980 30.868	79 13.435 39.303	17 2.891 16.170	588 100.000 32.468
11-15 YEARS	71 30.085 11.270	127 53.814 13.612	30 12.712 14.925	8 3.390 17.021	236 100.000 13.031
16+ YEARS	21 37.705 1.651	33 54.098 3.537	5 8.197 2.488		61 100.000 3.368
COLUMN SUMS	630 34.787 100.000	933 51.518 100.000	201 11.099 100.000	47 2.595 100.000	1811 100.000 100.000

Table 5-3 Adequacy of Communications by Institutional Size

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = NASFAA & SFA COMMUNICATION ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	211 13.555 16.783	294 50.342 11.545	52 8.904 25.871	7 1.199 14.894	584 100.000 32.301
1000- 3999	184 33.577 29.219	297 54.197 31.867	54 9.854 26.866	13 2.372 27.660	548 100.000 30.310
4000- 9999	95 32.313 15.127	152 51.701 16.309	39 13.265 19.403	8 2.721 17.021	294 100.000 16.261
10,000- 19,999	73 33.641 11.624	105 48.387 11.266	31 14.286 15.423	8 3.687 17.021	217 100.000 12.002
20,000+	45 27.273 7.166	84 50.909 9.013	25 15.152 12.438	11 6.667 23.404	165 100.000 27.126
COLUMN SUMS	628 34.735 100.000	932 51.549 100.000	201 11.117 100.000	47 2.600 100.000	1808 100.000 100.000

TABLES 5-4 Through 5-8 "In General, Professional Training Programs Which I Have Engaged in as a Participant Have Been Adequate"

Professional financial aid training programs were judged to be adequate by over 84 percent of the respondents with 59.5 percent of the respondents expressing moderate agreement with their adequacy (Table 5-4).

As shown in Table 5-5, respondents with Ph.D.'s were approximately twice as likely to find training programs inadequate as were respondents in other educational groups. Slightly over one-fourth of those holding the Ph.D. found training programs to be inadequate (significant at the .01 level).

Another group which tended to be more critical of the adequacy of training programs were respondents employed in offices serving graduate/professional students (significant at the .01 level). Respondents from graduate/professional programs represented approximately 7.9 percent of those completing the questionnaire, and slightly over one-fourth of them found training programs to be in need of improvement (Table 5-6).

There were no differences (at the .05 level) between responses relating to the adequacy of training based upon institutional type (public, independent, proprietary). However, there were significant differences (at the .01 level) between the perceived adequacy of training and the size of the respondent's institution. Respondents from small institutions were more likely to strongly agree that training had been adequate than were respondents from large institutions (Table 5-7).

The perceived adequacy of training programs was also related to geographic area (Table 5-8). Respondents from the Rocky Mountain region were the most likely to express satisfaction with training programs, while those from the Western region were the most likely to express dissatisfaction (significant at the .01 level).

Table 5-4 Adequacy of Training Programs by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIREC- TOR	339 25.037 75.333	821 60.635 75.668	157 11.595 69.163	37 2.733 58.710	1354 100.000 74.192	
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	32 19.876 7.111	93 57.764 8.571	27 16.770 11.894	9 5.590 14.286	161 100.000 8.822	
FIN.AID/ OFFICER/ COUN/AD	46 25.275 10.222	107 58.791 9.862	22 12.088 9.692	7 3.846 11.111	182 100.000 9.973	
OTHER	33 25.781 7.333	64 50.000 5.899	21 16.406 9.251	10 7.813 15.873	128 100.000 7.014	
COLUMN SUMS	450 24.658 100.000	1085 59.452 100.000	227 12.438 100.000	63 3.452 100.000	1825 100.000 100.000	

Table 5-5 Adequacy of Training Programs
by Education

EDUCATION: ROWS - HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED	PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				ROW SUMS
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
DUCTION- RATE	15	54	17	14	94
	15.157	57.447	18.085	8.511	100.000
	3.308	4.911	7.456	12.500	5.159
MASTERS	219	561	118	30	928
	21.519	60.451	12.716	3.213	100.000
	48.884	51.848	51.754	46.875	50.933
BACHE- LORS	138	300	72	21	531
	25.181	56.497	13.559	3.955	100.000
	10.804	27.726	31.579	32.813	29.144
ASSO- CIATE	27	43	5	1	76
	15.526	56.579	6.579	1.316	100.000
	6.327	3.974	2.193	1.563	4.171
OTHER	40	124	16	4	193
	25.383	64.249	8.290	2.073	100.000
	10.338	11.460	7.018	6.250	10.593
COLUMN SUMS	449	1082	228	64	1822
	24.588	59.385	12.514	3.513	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 5-6 Adequacy of Training Programs
by Kinds of Students Served

KINDS OF STUDENTS ROWS - SERVED	PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?				ROW SUMS
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
GR/PROF ONLY	23	84	24	13	144
	15.172	59.313	16.667	9.028	100.000
	5.122	7.742	10.526	20.313	7.886
UNDERGR STUD. ONLY	269	579	100	24	971
	27.600	59.629	10.299	2.472	100.000
	59.688	53.364	43.860	17.500	53.176
GR/PROF STUD.	158	422	104	27	711
	22.222	59.353	14.627	3.717	100.000
	35.189	38.874	45.614	42.188	38.938
COLUMN SUMS	449	1085	228	64	1826
	24.589	59.419	12.486	3.505	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 5-7 Adequacy of Training Programs
by Institutional Size

ROWS = SIZE		INSTITUTIONAL				COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?	
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODEP- ATFLY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
UNDER 1000		161 26.969 35.857	354 59.296 32.657	72 12.060 31.718	10 1.675 15.625	597 100.000 32.730	
1000- 3999		147 27.072 32.739	316 58.195 29.151	61 11.234 26.872	19 3.499 29.688	543 100.000 29.770	
4000- 9999		70 23.810 15.590	177 60.204 16.328	33 11.224 14.537	14 4.762 21.875	294 100.000 16.118	
10,000- 19,999		47 21.171 10.468	134 60.360 12.362	33 14.865 14.537	8 3.604 12.500	222 100.000 12.171	
20,000+		24 14.286 5.145	103 61.310 9.502	28 16.667 12.335	13 7.738 20.313	168 100.000 9.211	
COLUMN SUMS		449 24.616 100.000	1084 59.430 100.000	227 12.445 100.000	64 3.509 100.000	1824 100.000 100.000	

Table 5-8 Adequacy of Training Programs
by Geographic Area

ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES		REGIONAL				COLUMNS = PROF. TRAINING PROGRAMS ADEQUATE?	
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
EASFAA		113 22.510 25.508	308 61.355 28.678	64 12.749 28.444	17 3.386 27.419	502 100.000 27.827	
SASFAA		86 30.389 19.413	156 55.124 14.525	32 11.307 14.222	9 3.180 14.516	283 100.000 15.687	
MASFAA		130 24.074 29.345	333 61.667 31.006	62 11.481 27.556	15 2.778 24.194	540 100.000 29.933	
SWASFAA		40 23.952 9.029	100 59.880 9.311	21 12.575 9.333	6 3.593 9.677	167 100.000 9.257	
RNASFAA		34 39.080 7.675	48 55.172 4.469	5 5.747 2.222		87 100.000 4.823	
WASFAA		40 17.778 9.029	129 57.333 12.011	41 18.222 18.222	15 6.667 24.194	225 100.000 12.472	
COLUMN SUMS		443 24.557 100.000	1074 59.534 100.000	225 12.472 100.000	62 3.437 100.000	1804 100.000 100.000	

TABLES 6-1 Through 6-3 "Institutions Should Have Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers Between the SEOG, CWS, and NDSL Programs"

The need for increased authority for interfund transfers received overwhelming support (Table 6-1). Over 60 percent of the respondents strongly agreed with the need for increased authority in this area and over 91 percent agreed (either strongly or moderately). Strong support was also received among all varieties of institutional type, control, and size. As institutional size increased, there was a significant tendency (at the .01 level) for stronger agreement with the need for liberalized transfer policies (Table 6-2).

Liberalized transfer policies received the support of no less than 88 percent of the respondents in each of the six geographic regions of the country (Table 6-3).

Table 6-1 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Title

		NEED FOR SEOG/ COLUMNS = CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?				
ROWS	TITLE	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRFC- TOP		812	351	83	35	1281
		61.388	27.400	6.479	2.732	100.000
		77.773	69.505	77.570	79.545	75.353
ASSOC./ ASSIST. DIRECT.		91	56	6	1	154
		59.091	36.364	3.896	0.649	100.000
		8.716	11.089	5.607	2.273	9.059
FIN. AID OFFICER COUNCIL		85	58	11	4	158
		51.797	36.709	6.962	2.532	100.000
		8.142	11.485	10.280	9.091	9.294
OTHER		56	40	7	4	107
		52.316	37.383	6.542	3.718	100.000
		5.164	7.921	6.542	9.091	6.294
COLUMN SUMS		1044	505	107	44	1700
		61.412	29.706	6.294	2.588	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-2 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL				NEED FOR SEOG/ CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?	
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS =			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER	26.3	197	33	14	512
1000	52.344	38.477	6.445	2.734	100.000
	25.720	18.780	31.132	31.818	30.118
1000-	332	145	36	18	531
3999	62.524	27.307	6.740	3.320	100.000
	31.862	28.543	31.962	40.909	31.235
4000-	191	70	20	4	285
9999	67.018	24.561	7.018	1.404	100.000
	18.330	13.780	18.868	9.091	16.765
10,000-	140	53	11	7	211
19,999	66.351	25.118	5.213	3.318	100.000
	13.436	10.433	10.377	15.909	12.412
20,000+	111	43	6	1	161
	68.944	26.708	3.727	0.621	100.000
	10.653	8.465	5.660	2.273	9.471
COLUMN	1042	508	106	44	1700
SUMS	61.294	29.882	6.235	2.588	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-3 Increased Authority for Interfund Transfers by Geographic Area

REGIONAL		NEED FOR SEOG/ CWS/NDSL INTER FUND TRANSFERS?				
ROWS =	ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES	COLUMNS =				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		295	135	30	9	469
		62.900	28.785	6.397	1.919	100.000
		28.447	27.000	28.571	21.429	27.850
SASFAA		142	102	18	6	268
		52.985	38.060	6.716	2.239	100.000
		13.693	20.400	17.143	14.286	15.914
MASFAA		304	154	25	12	495
		61.414	31.111	5.051	2.424	100.000
		29.315	30.800	23.810	28.571	29.394
SWASFAA		98	40	13	4	155
		63.226	25.806	8.387	2.581	100.000
		9.450	8.000	12.381	9.524	9.204
RNASFAA		54	20	7	3	84
		64.286	23.810	8.333	3.571	100.000
		5.207	4.000	6.667	7.143	4.988
WASFAA		144	49	12	8	213
		67.606	23.005	5.634	3.756	100.000
		13.886	9.800	11.429	19.048	12.648
COLUMN SUMS		1037	500	105	42	1684
		61.580	29.691	6.235	2.494	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 6-4 Through 6-6

"My Institution Would have a Greater Feeling
of Responsibility for the BEOG and GSL Programs
if we Received a Federal Administrative Allowance"

Over 81 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that receipt of a federal administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG and GSL programs. Directors of Financial Aid were more likely to agree with the above statement than were respondents in other job categories (Table 6-4). Respondents from public institutions were the most likely to strongly agree that an administrative allowance in the BEOG and GSL programs would promote a greater sense of institutional responsibility (Table 6-5).

There were some differences in responses to this question based upon region of the country (Table 6-6). However, no fewer than 78.5 percent of the respondents in any region agreed that payment of an administrative allowance would promote a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG and GSL programs.

Table 6-4 Greater Responsibility if Received
Administrative Allowance by Title

ROWS - TITLE		FED. ADMINI. ALLOW COLUMNS = INCR. RESP FOR REG & GSL PROGRAMS?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	712	337	141	82	1272	
	55.975	26.494	11.085	6.447	100.000	
	77.814	71.398	68.116	73.214	74.560	
ASSOC./	76	45	27	10	158	
ASSIS.	48.101	28.481	17.089	6.329	100.000	
DIRECT.	8.106	9.534	13.043	8.929	9.261	
FIN. AID	70	58	25	9	162	
OFFICER	41.210	35.802	15.432	5.556	100.000	
COORD.	7.650	12.288	12.077	8.036	9.496	
OTHER	57	32	14	11	114	
	50.000	28.070	12.281	9.649	100.000	
	6.230	6.780	6.763	9.821	6.682	
COLUMN SUMS	915	472	207	112	1706	
	51.634	27.667	12.134	6.565	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 6-5 Greater Responsibility if Received Administrative Allowance by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL					FED. ADMINI. ALLOW	
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:					COLUMNS = INCR. RESP FOR	
					BEOG & GSL PROGRAMS?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	454	186	81	33	754	
	60.212	24.668	10.743	4.377	100.000	
	49.672	39.490	38.942	29.730	44.249	
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	391	240	112	68	811	
	48.212	29.593	13.810	8.385	100.000	
	42.779	50.955	53.846	61.261	47.594	
PROPRI- ETARY	69	45	15	10	139	
	49.640	32.374	10.791	7.194	100.000	
	7.549	9.554	7.212	9.009	8.157	
COLUMN SUMS	914	471	208	111	1704	
	53.638	27.641	12.207	6.514	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 6-6 Greater Responsibility if Received Administrative Allowance by Geographic Area

REGIONAL					FED. ADMINI. ALLOW	
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS					COLUMNS = INCR. RESP FOR	
					BEOG & GSL PROGRAMS?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
EASFAA	238	124	64	33	459	
	51.852	27.015	13.943	7.190	100.000	
	26.298	26.609	31.373	29.464	27.208	
SASFAA	167	63	25	17	272	
	61.397	23.162	9.191	6.250	100.000	
	18.453	13.519	12.255	15.179	16.123	
MASFAA	233	163	73	35	504	
	46.230	32.341	14.484	6.944	100.000	
	25.746	34.979	35.784	31.250	29.876	
SWASFAA	86	47	12	11	156	
	55.128	30.128	7.692	7.051	100.000	
	9.503	10.086	5.882	9.821	9.247	
RHASFAA	53	17	9	4	83	
	63.855	20.482	10.843	4.819	100.000	
	5.856	3.648	4.412	3.571	4.920	
WASFAA	128	52	21	12	213	
	60.094	24.413	9.859	5.634	100.000	
	14.144	11.159	10.294	10.714	12.626	
COLUMN SUMS	905	466	204	112	1687	
	53.646	27.623	12.092	6.639	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

TABLES 6-7 and 6-8 "The Tri-Partite Application Process Should be Revised to Depend more Heavily Upon Verifiable, Historical Data"

The need to change the Tri-Partite application process to depend more upon verifiable, historical data was expressed by 79.9 percent of the respondents. There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) to responses to this question by type or control of institution, institutional size, or region of the country. However, as years of experience increase, there is a noticeable tendency (significant at the .05 level) for respondents to agree more strongly with the need to use verifiable, historical data in the Tri-Partite application process.

Table 6-7 Tri-Partite Application Process
Should be Revised by Title

ROWS - TITLE		REVISE TRI-PARTITE COLUMNS = APPLICATION PROCESS?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder- ately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	442	531	197	55	1227	
	36.023	43.439	16.055	4.482	100.000	
	77.273	71.517	76.357	79.710	75.554	
ASSOC. / DIRECT.	57	63	11	4	143	
	39.860	44.056	13.287	2.797	100.000	
	9.165	8.690	7.364	5.797	8.805	
FIN. AID OFFICER / COUNCIL	43	79	26	5	153	
	24.105	51.634	16.991	3.268	100.000	
	7.517	10.897	10.078	7.246	9.421	
OTHER	30	50	16	5	101	
	23.703	49.505	15.842	4.950	100.000	
	5.245	6.897	6.202	7.246	6.219	
COLUMN SUMS	572	725	258	69	1624	
	35.222	44.643	15.887	4.249	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 6-8 Tri-Partite Application Process Should
be Revised by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = REVISE TRI-PARTITE APPLICATION PROCESS?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	51 27.273 8.932	98 52.406 13.462	32 17.112 12.451	6 3.209 8.571	187 100.000 11.501
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	97 33.564 16.998	135 46.713 18.544	50 17.301 19.455	7 2.422 10.000	289 100.000 17.774
4-5 YEARS	101 30.982 17.688	149 45.706 20.467	55 16.871 21.401	21 6.442 30.000	326 100.000 20.049
6-10 YEARS	206 37.798 36.077	233 42.752 32.005	85 15.596 33.074	21 3.853 30.000	545 100.000 33.518
11-15 YEARS	92 40.708 16.112	91 40.265 12.500	29 12.832 11.284	14 6.195 20.000	226 100.000 13.899
16+ YEARS	24 45.283 4.203	22 41.509 3.022	6 11.321 2.335	1 1.887 1.429	53 100.000 3.260
COLUMN SUMS	571 35.117 100.000	728 44.772 100.000	257 15.806 100.000	70 4.305 100.000	1626 100.000 100.000

TABLES 6-9 Through 6-11 "The Regional Review Panel Process is an Equitable Way of Making Funding Decisions"

Approximately 50 percent of the respondents agreed that the panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions while 50 percent disagreed. However, 22.2 percent expressed strong disagreement, while only 7.8 percent strongly agreed that the panel process was an equitable vehicle for funding decisions. Based upon title, there were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in responses to the perceived equity of the panel process.

As shown in Table 6-10, respondents from proprietary institutions were approximately twice as likely as those from other groups of institutions to strongly agree that the panel process is an equitable way to make funding decisions.

Support for the panel process decreases as institutional size increases (Table 6-11). Respondents from the largest institutions were twice as likely to express strong disagreement as those from institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (significant at the .01 level).

Table 6-9 The Regional Panel Process
is Equitable by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = REGIONAL REVIEW EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIRFC- TOR	105 8.261 77.545	503 39.575 71.004	369 29.032 75.153	294 23.131 78.610	1271 100.000 75.386	
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	10 6.711 7.576	50 38.926 8.418	49 32.886 9.980	32 21.477 8.556	149 100.000 8.837	
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	8 4.908 6.061	78 47.853 11.121	42 25.767 8.554	35 21.472 9.358	163 100.000 9.668	
OTHER	9 8.738 6.818	50 48.544 7.257	31 30.097 6.314	13 12.621 3.476	103 100.000 6.109	
COLUMN SUMS	112 7.829 100.000	689 40.866 100.000	491 29.122 100.000	374 22.183 100.000	1686 100.000 100.000	

Table 6-10 The Regional Panel Process is
Equitable by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL		REGIONAL REVIEW			
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:		COLUMNS = EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	47	291	235	177	750
	6.267	38.800	31.333	23.600	100.000
	35.878	42.113	47.764	47.453	44.458
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	64	347	229	169	809
	7.911	42.892	28.307	20.890	100.000
	48.855	50.217	46.545	45.308	47.955
PROPRI- ETARY	20	53	28	27	128
	15.625	41.406	21.875	21.094	100.000
	15.267	7.670	5.691	7.239	7.587
COLUMN SUMS	131	691	492	373	1687
	7.765	40.960	29.164	22.110	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-11 The Regional Panel Process is Equitable
by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL		REGIONAL REVIEW			
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = EQUITABLE FOR FUNDING DECISIONS?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	48	249	150	72	519
	9.249	47.977	28.902	13.873	100.000
	37.209	36.035	30.426	19.303	30.783
1000- 9999	36	216	150	120	522
	6.897	41.379	28.716	22.989	100.000
	27.907	31.259	30.426	32.172	30.961
4000- 9999	23	100	76	84	283
	8.127	35.336	26.855	29.682	100.000
	17.829	14.472	15.416	22.520	16.785
10,000- 19,999	16	76	57	56	205
	7.805	17.073	27.805	27.317	100.000
	12.403	10.999	11.562	15.013	12.159
20,000+	6	50	60	41	157
	3.822	31.847	18.217	26.115	100.000
	4.651	7.236	12.170	10.992	9.312
COLUMN SUMS	129	691	493	373	1686
	7.651	40.985	29.241	22.123	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 6-12 Through 6-14 "There is a Need for Periodic Program Reviews of Financial Aid Offices by U. S. Office of Education Staff"

The need for periodic program reviews by the U. S. Office of Education was underscored by the fact that over 90 percent of the respondents agreed that they were necessary (Table 6-12). Respondents from public institutions expressed the strongest sentiments in favor of periodic program reviews, although over 87 percent of the respondents from independent and proprietary institutions agreed (either moderately or strongly) with the need for periodic program reviews (Table 6-13).

As years of experience in financial aid increase, there is a significant tendency (at the .01 level) for respondents to express stronger agreement with the need for program reviews by the U. S. Office of Education (Table 6-14).

Table 6-12 Need for USOE Program Reviews by Title

ROWS = TITLE		NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR		672	566	80	28	1346
		49.926	42.051	5.944	2.080	100.000
		77.509	71.016	72.072	62.222	73.956
ASSOC. / ASSIS.		82	72	7	3	164
		50.000	43.902	4.268	1.829	100.000
		9.458	9.034	6.306	6.667	9.011
DIRECT.		59	105	14	4	182
		32.418	57.692	7.692	2.198	100.000
		6.805	13.174	12.613	9.889	10.000
OTHER		54	54	10	10	128
		42.198	42.188	7.813	7.813	100.000
		6.224	6.775	9.009	22.222	7.033
COLUMNS SUMS		867	797	111	45	1820
		47.637	43.791	6.099	2.473	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-13 Need for USOE Program Reviews
by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL					NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS	
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION					BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	449	305	21	14	789	
	56.907	38.657	2.662	1.774	100.000	
	51.408	38.269	18.750	31.818	43.399	
INDEP.	355	420	78	28	881	
(PPI- VATE)	40.295	47.673	8.854	3.178	100.000	
	41.040	52.698	69.643	63.636	48.460	
PROPRI- ETARY	61	72	13	2	148	
	41.216	48.649	8.784	1.351	100.000	
	7.052	9.034	11.607	4.545	8.141	
COLUMN SUMS	865	797	112	44	1818	
	47.580	43.839	6.161	2.420	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 6-14 Need for USOE Program Reviews
by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID					NEED PROGRAM REVIEWS	
					BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
1 YEAR	73	124	30	6	233	
EXPER. OR LESS	31.330	53.219	12.876	2.575	100.000	
	8.439	15.481	27.027	13.333	12.788	
2-3 YEARS	140	167	18	5	330	
EXPER.	42.424	50.606	5.455	1.515	100.000	
	16.185	20.849	16.216	11.111	18.112	
4-5 YEARS	190	151	18	10	369	
	51.491	40.921	4.878	2.710	100.000	
	21.965	18.851	16.216	22.222	20.252	
6-10 YEARS	311	237	31	16	595	
	52.269	39.832	5.210	2.689	100.000	
	35.954	29.588	27.928	35.556	32.656	
11-15 YEARS	118	104	12	4	238	
	49.580	43.697	5.042	1.681	100.000	
	13.642	12.984	10.811	8.889	13.063	
16+ YEARS	33	18	2	4	57	
	57.895	31.579	3.509	7.018	100.000	
	3.815	2.247	1.802	8.889	3.128	
COLUMN SUMS	865	801	111	45	1822	
	47.475	43.963	6.092	2.470	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

TABLE 6-15 Through 6-17 "My Institution has Received Good Support From the Regional U. S. Office of Education"

Over 85 percent of the respondents agreed (either strongly or moderately) that their institution had received good support from the Regional Office of Education. Directors of Financial Aid were most likely to strongly agree that their institution had received good support (Table 6-15).

There were no significant differences in responses to the above statement based upon control or size of the respondents' institutions. There were, however, differences by institutional type, but no group of institutions had less than 78 percent of their respondents expressing strong or moderate agreement that their institution had received good support (Table 6-16).

As shown in Table 6-17, there were significant differences (at the .01 level) between whether respondents thought they had received good support from the Office of Education based upon geographic region. However, at least 70 percent of the respondents in each region stated that they had received good support. Respondents from the states covered by the Rocky Mountain, Southern, and Southwestern financial aid associations were most likely to express strong agreement, while respondents from WASFAA were most likely to express either moderate or strong disagreement.

Table 6-15 Good Support from Regional USOE by Title

ROWS - TITLE		COLUMNS - GOOD SUPPORT FROM U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION?				
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRCT- TOR		523	596	149	36	1304
		40.167	45.566	11.315	2.752	100.000
		80.166	70.952	78.307	63.158	75.043
ASSOC./ ASST.		53	82	15	5	155
		34.194	52.903	9.677	3.226	100.000
		8.067	9.762	7.937	8.772	8.893
FIN.AID/ OFFICER		50	93	16	9	168
		29.762	55.357	9.524	5.357	100.000
		7.610	11.071	8.466	15.789	9.639
OTHER		26	69	10	7	112
		23.214	61.607	8.929	6.250	100.000
		3.957	8.214	5.291	12.281	6.426
COLUMN SUMS		657	840	189	57	1743
		37.694	48.193	10.843	3.270	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-16 Good Support from Regional
USOE by Institutional Type

INSTITUTIONAL		GOOD SUPPORT FROM			
ROWS = TYPE		U.S. OFFICE OF			
		EDUCATION?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC.	68	74	9	2	153
TECH.	44.444	48.366	5.882	1.307	100.000
	10.625	9.035	4.891	3.636	9.011
2 YEARS	117	174	33	14	338
6 UNDER	34.615	51.479	9.763	4.142	100.000
NOT V.T.	18.281	21.245	17.935	25.455	19.906
4 YEAR	181	194	45	9	429
	42.191	45.221	10.490	2.098	100.000
	28.281	23.687	24.457	16.364	25.265
4 YEAR	238	294	79	18	629
AND	37.838	46.741	12.560	2.862	100.000
BEYOND	37.188	35.897	42.935	32.727	37.044
NURSING	13	16	3	3	35
	37.143	45.714	8.571	8.571	100.000
	2.031	1.954	1.630	5.455	2.061
GRAD/ PROFS.	23	67	15	9	114
ONLY	20.175	58.772	13.158	7.895	100.000
	3.594	8.181	8.152	16.364	6.714
COLUMN SUMS	640	819	184	55	1698
	37.691	48.233	10.836	3.239	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 6-17 Good Support from Regional
USOE by Geographic Area

REGIONAL		GOOD SUPPORT FROM			
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS		U.S. OFFICE OF			
		EDUCATION?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	140	266	58	18	482
	29.046	55.187	12.033	3.734	100.000
	21.538	32.048	31.183	31.579	27.974
SASFAA	131	119	14	4	268
	48.981	44.403	5.224	1.493	100.000
	20.154	14.337	7.527	7.018	15.554
MASFAA	172	261	57	16	506
	33.992	51.581	11.265	3.162	100.000
	26.462	31.446	30.645	28.070	29.367
SWASFAA	96	55	11	2	164
	58.537	33.537	6.707	1.220	100.000
	14.769	6.627	5.914	3.509	9.518
RHASFAA	57	27	2		86
	66.279	31.395	2.326		100.000
	8.769	3.253	1.075		4.991
WASFAA	54	102	44	17	217
	24.885	47.005	20.276	7.834	100.000
	8.308	12.289	23.656	29.825	12.594
COLUMN SUMS	650	830	186	57	1723
	37.725	48.172	10.795	3.308	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 7-1 Through 7-4 "Even Given Equal Financial Need, Half-Time Students are Less Likely to be Assisted than Full-Time Students at my Institution"

As shown in Table 7-1, approximately two-thirds of the respondents stated that, given equal need, half-time students would be less likely to be assisted at their institution than full-time students. There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in responses to the above statement depending upon institutional type and control (Table 7-2). For example, respondents from proprietary institutions were approximately twice as likely as respondents from independent institutions to disagree with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students.

The highest level of disagreement (72.2%) with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students came from respondents working for Nursing Schools. Over 40 percent of the respondents from vocational/technical schools and 2-year colleges disagreed with the statement that at their institution, half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students (Table 7-3).

Reactions to the likelihood of financial aid for half-time students varied significantly (at the .01 level) based upon region of the country. For example, in EASFAA states, 23.9 percent of respondents disagreed with the statement that half-time students were less likely to be assisted than full-time students. In SWASFAA states, however, over 46 percent of the respondents disagreed.

Table 7-1 Full-Time Students Receive Priority by Title

ROWS - TITLE		FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	176	430	192	202	1200	
FOR	11.333	35.833	16.000	16.833	100.000	
	12.331	76.512	75.294	72.662	74.212	
ASSOC./	60	43	24	24	151	
ASSIST.	19.735	28.477	15.894	15.894	100.000	
DIRECT.	11.494	7.651	9.412	8.633	9.338	
FIN. AID	42	57	19	30	148	
OFFICER	28.179	38.514	12.818	20.270	100.000	
COORD/AD	4.048	10.142	7.451	10.791	9.153	
OTHER	44	32	20	22	118	
	37.288	27.119	16.949	18.644	100.000	
	4.429	5.694	7.843	7.914	7.297	
COLUMN	522	562	255	278	1617	
SUMS	32.282	34.756	15.770	17.192	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 7-2 Full-Time Students Receive Priority
by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL					FULL-TIME STUD. GET AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION					
COLUMNS =					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	214	244	131	147	736
	29.076	33.152	17.799	19.973	100.000
	41.154	43.494	50.973	52.878	45.545
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	284	287	101	103	775
	36.645	37.032	13.032	13.290	100.000
	54.615	51.159	39.300	37.050	47.958
PROPRI- ETARY	22	30	25	28	105
	20.952	28.571	23.810	26.667	100.000
	4.231	5.348	9.728	10.072	6.498
COLUMN SUMS	520	561	257	278	1616
	32.178	34.715	15.903	17.203	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-3 Full-Time Students Receive Priority
by Institutional Type

INSTITUTIONAL				FULL-TIME STUD. GET	
ROWS = TYPE				COLUMNS = AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?	
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC.	26	36	22	34	118
TECH.	22.034	30.508	18.644	28.814	100.000
	5.039	6.642	8.871	12.734	7.502
2 YEARS	85	109	73	62	329
5 UNDER	25.836	33.131	22.188	18.845	100.000
NOT V.T.	16.473	20.111	29.435	23.221	20.915
4 YEAR	146	143	59	53	401
	36.409	35.661	14.713	13.217	100.000
	28.295	26.384	21.790	19.850	25.493
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	227	232	79	97	635
	35.748	36.535	12.441	15.276	100.000
	43.992	42.804	31.855	36.330	40.369
NURSING	3	2	6	7	18
	16.667	11.111	33.333	38.889	100.000
	0.581	0.369	2.419	2.622	1.144
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	29	20	9	14	72
	40.278	27.778	12.500	19.444	100.000
	5.620	3.690	3.629	5.243	4.577
COLUMN SUMS	516	542	248	267	1573
	32.804	34.456	15.766	16.974	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-4 Full-Time Students Receive Priority
by Geographic Area

REGIONAL ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES		FULL-TIME STUD. GET COLUMNS = AID PRIORITY OVER HALF-TIME STUDENTS?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	155	163	50	50	418
	37.081	38.995	11.962	11.962	100.000
	30.039	29.369	19.455	18.382	26.125
SASFAA	81	80	53	48	262
	30.916	30.534	20.229	18.321	100.000
	15.698	14.414	20.623	17.647	16.375
MASFAA	153	182	88	75	498
	30.723	36.546	17.671	15.060	100.000
	29.651	32.793	34.241	27.574	31.125
SWASFAA	40	40	25	45	150
	26.667	26.667	16.667	30.000	100.000
	7.752	7.207	9.728	16.544	9.375
RNASFAA	27	24	15	11	77
	35.065	31.169	19.481	14.286	100.000
	5.233	4.324	5.837	4.044	4.813
WASFAA	60	66	26	43	195
	30.769	33.846	13.333	22.051	100.000
	11.628	11.892	10.117	15.809	12.188
COLUMN SUMS	516	555	257	272	1600
	32.250	34.688	16.063	17.000	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 7-5 Through 7-8

"There has been an Unacceptable Amount of Deliberate Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs at my Institution"

A total of 85.3 percent of the respondents disagreed that there had "been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs" at their institution. 57.2 percent expressed strong disagreement with the statement, while 28.1 percent stated moderate disagreement (Table 7-5).

Respondents from public institutions were the most likely to agree that there had been an unacceptable amount of student abuse, while aid administrators at independent institutions were least likely to report such abuse (Table 7-6).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in perceptions of student abuse based upon institutional size. There was a noticeable tendency for respondents to report unacceptable amounts of student abuse as size increased. For example, 9.5 percent of the respondents from institutions of under 1,000 students reported unacceptable amounts of abuse, while the figure was over 25 percent for respondents from institutions of 20,000 or more students (Table 7-7).

Respondents from public community colleges with enrollments of 4,000 and over were the most likely to identify the existence of student abuse, but only 4.3 percent of this group expressed strong agreement that there had been an unacceptable amount of deliberate abuse. Respondents from independent graduate/professional schools were the least likely group to express concern about student abuse (Table 7-8).

Table 7-5 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Title

ROW - TITLE	TOO MUCH DELIBERATE COLUMNS - STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?				ROW SUMS
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	
DIRECTOR	351	1051	366	805	1351
FOR	2.591	10.733	27.011	59.585	100.000
	77.778	65.022	71.206	76.836	73.866
ASSOC./	21	291	531	861	164
ASSIST.	1.220	17.683	12.317	48.780	100.000
DIRECT.	4.444	13.004	10.311	7.641	8.967
FIN.AID	21	261	64	88	180
OFFICER	1.111	14.444	35.556	48.889	100.000
COORD/AD	4.444	11.659	12.451	8.405	9.841
OTHER	61	231	31	74	134
	4.479	17.164	21.134	55.224	100.000
	13.333	10.311	6.031	7.068	7.326
COLUMN	45	223	514	1047	1829
SUMS	2.460	12.172	28.103	57.244	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-6 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse
of Financial Aid Programs by
Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL		TOO MUCH DELIBERATE				
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION		COLUMNS = STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?				
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	32	139	249	356	776	
	4.124	17.912	32.088	45.876	100.000	
	71.111	61.778	48.633	34.034	42.451	
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	10	68	222	606	906	
	1.104	7.506	24.503	66.887	100.000	
	22.222	30.222	43.359	57.935	49.562	
PROPRI- ETARY	3	18	41	84	146	
	2.055	12.329	28.082	57.534	100.000	
	6.667	8.000	8.008	8.031	7.987	
COLUMN SUMS	45	225	512	1046	1828	
	2.462	12.309	28.009	57.221	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 7-7 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse
of Financial Aid Programs by
Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL				TOO MUCH DELIBERATE	
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = STUDENT ABUSE OF FIN.AID PROGRAMS?			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
UNDER	7	50	141	401	599
1000	1.169	8.347	23.539	66.945	100.000
	15.709	22.124	27.539	38.300	32.750
1000-	12	62	158	309	541
3999	2.218	11.460	29.205	57.116	100.000
	27.273	27.434	30.859	29.513	29.579
4000-	9	48	88	155	300
9999	3.000	16.000	29.333	51.667	100.000
	20.455	21.239	17.188	14.804	16.402
10,000-	8	32	71	113	224
19,999	3.571	14.286	31.696	50.446	100.000
	18.182	14.159	13.867	10.793	12.247
20,000+	8	34	54	69	165
	4.848	20.606	32.727	41.818	100.000
	18.182	15.044	10.547	6.590	9.021
COLUMN SUMS	44	226	512	1047	1829
	2.406	12.356	27.993	57.244	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-8 Unacceptable Amount of Student Abuse of Financial Aid Programs by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS =		INSTITUTIONAL		COLUMNS =		TOO MUCH DELIBERATE
		TYPE AND SIZE				STUDENT ABUSE OF
						FIN.AID PROGRAMS?
		STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER- DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC		6	17	39	44	106
4 YEAR+		5.660	16.038	36.792	41.509	100.000
<7000		13.636	7.798	7.847	4.301	5.948
PUBLIC		7	16	46	65	134
4 YEAR+		5.224	11.940	34.328	48.507	100.000
7-19999		15.909	7.339	9.256	6.354	7.520
PUBLIC		4	20	40	51	115
4 YEAR+		3.478	17.391	34.783	44.348	100.000
20,000+		9.091	9.174	8.048	4.985	6.453
PUBLIC			10	14	16	40
4 YEAR			25.000	35.000	40.000	100.000
<4000			4.587	2.817	1.564	2.245
PUBLIC			6	8	15	29
4 YEAR			20.690	27.586	51.724	100.000
4,000+			2.752	1.610	1.466	1.627
PUBLIC		4	20	36	55	115
2 YEAR		3.478	17.391	31.304	47.826	100.000
<4000		9.091	9.174	7.243	5.376	6.453
PUBLIC		5	32	34	45	116
2 YEAR		4.310	27.586	29.310	38.793	100.000
4,000+		11.364	14.679	6.841	4.399	6.510
PUBLIC,		2	1	6	22	31
GRAD/		6.452	3.226	19.355	70.968	100.000
PROF		4.545	0.459	1.207	2.151	1.740
INDEP		2	11	40	103	156
4 YEAR+		1.282	7.051	25.641	66.026	100.000
<4000		4.545	5.046	8.048	10.066	8.754
INDEP		1	16	42	84	143
4 YEAR+		0.699	11.189	29.371	58.741	100.000
4,000+		2.273	7.339	8.451	8.211	8.025
INDEP		2	10	36	134	182
4 YEAR		1.099	5.495	19.780	73.626	100.000
<1000		4.545	4.587	7.243	13.099	10.213
INDEP		3	12	35	87	137
4 YEAR		2.190	8.759	25.547	63.504	100.000
1-1,999		6.818	5.505	7.042	8.504	7.688
INDEP			6	15	34	55
4 YEAR			10.909	27.273	61.818	100.000
2,000+			2.752	3.018	3.324	3.086
INDEP			5	18	47	70
2 YEAR			7.143	25.714	67.143	100.000
			2.294	3.622	4.574	3.928
INDEP		2	2	25	74	103
GRAD/		1.942	1.942	24.272	71.845	100.000
PROF		4.545	0.917	5.030	7.234	5.780
PUBLIC			3	6	26	35
INDEP			8.571	17.143	74.286	100.000
NURSING			1.376	1.207	2.542	1.964
PUBLIC		3	13	16	37	69
INDEP		4.348	18.841	23.188	53.623	100.000
VOC.TEC		6.818	5.963	3.219	3.617	3.872
PROPRI.		2	9	26	49	86
VOC.TEC		2.326	10.465	30.233	56.977	100.000
		4.545	4.128	5.231	4.790	4.826
ALL		1	9	15	35	60
OTHER		1.667	15.000	25.000	58.333	100.000
PROPRI.		2.273	4.128	3.018	3.421	3.367
COLUMN		44	218	497	1023	1782
SUMS		2.469	12.233	27.890	57.407	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 7-9 Through 7-14 "There Should be a Formal Certification Process for Financial Aid Administrators"

The question of "to certify, or not to certify" has received a great deal of attention, especially in the past several years. Over three-fourths of the respondents were in favor of a formal certification process for financial aid administrators. Slightly more than one-third of the respondents said they "strongly" agreed with the need for certification of aid administrators. There were no statistically significant differences (at the .05 level) in responses based on title (see Table 7-9), race, sex, or institutional size.

Support for certification of aid administrators was strongest among those with between 4 to 10 years of financial aid experience (approximately 80 percent were in favor of certification). On the other hand, almost one-half of the respondents with over 16 years of experience were opposed to certification. Differences in responses based on length of employment in financial aid were significant at the .01 level (Table 7-10).

Significant differences (at the .01 level) were also apparent based upon respondents' level of education. Holders of the Ph.D. were approximately twice as likely to disagree with the need for certification as were other respondents (Table 7-11).

Although respondents from the three major categories of institutions (public, independent, proprietary) overwhelmingly supported the need for certification, respondents from public institutions expressed the highest levels of support (Table 7-12). Over 70 percent of the respondents from 4 out of the 6 categories of institutional type (vocational/technical, 2-year, 4-year college, and university) expressed support for certification. The strongest support came from respondents in the vocational/technical area, while respondents from graduate/professional schools expressed the greatest dissatisfaction with certification (Table 7-13).

No area of the country had less than 70 percent of its respondents favoring a certification process for aid administrators. The most dissatisfaction with certification was found in the EASFAA region, while over 80 percent of the respondents in 4 out of the 5 remaining regions supported certification (Table 7-14).

Table 7-9 There Should be Certification of
Aid Administrators by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder. Dis- agree	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DIRECT- TOP	471 35.176 76.337	568 42.420 74.443	196 14.638 68.531	104 7.767 69.333	1339 100.000 73.733
ASSOC./ DIRECT.	55 33.951 8.914	62 38.272 8.126	28 17.284 9.790	17 10.494 11.333	162 100.000 8.921
FIN.AID OFFICER	53 28.462 8.590	79 43.169 10.354	36 19.672 12.587	15 8.197 10.000	183 100.000 10.077
COUN/AD OTHER	38 28.788 6.159	54 40.909 7.077	26 19.697 9.091	14 10.606 9.333	132 100.000 7.269
COLUMN SUMS	617 33.976 100.000	763 42.015 100.000	286 15.749 100.000	150 8.260 100.000	1816 100.000 100.000

Table 7-10 There Should be Certification of Aid
Administrators by Years Worked

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN
FINANCIAL AID
COLUMNS = NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moder- ately AGREE	Moder. Dis- agree	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	72 29.876 11.632	101 41.909 13.255	56 23.237 19.580	12 4.979 8.000	241 100.000 13.264
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	95 28.190 15.347	153 45.401 20.079	53 15.727 18.531	36 10.682 24.000	337 100.000 18.547
4-5 YEARS	154 42.308 24.879	142 39.011 18.635	46 12.637 16.084	22 6.044 14.667	364 100.000 20.033
6-10 YEARS	218 37.012 35.218	247 41.935 32.415	75 12.733 26.224	49 8.319 32.667	589 100.000 32.416
11-15 YEARS	71 30.870 11.470	99 43.043 12.992	43 18.696 15.035	17 7.391 11.333	230 100.000 12.658
16+ YEARS	9 16.071 1.454	20 35.714 2.625	13 23.214 4.545	14 25.000 9.333	56 100.000 3.082
COLUMN SUMS	619 34.067 100.000	762 41.937 100.000	286 15.740 100.000	150 8.255 100.000	1817 100.000 100.000

Table 7-11 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Educational Level

EDUCATION:				NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?	
ROWS = HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	Moderately AGREE	Moderately DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	24 25.000 1.883	30 31.250 3.937	20 20.833 6.991	22 22.917 14.966	96 100.000 5.295
MASTERS	342 37.093 55.340	371 40.239 48.688	147 15.944 51.399	62 6.725 42.177	922 100.000 50.855
BACHELORS	163 31.520 27.184	244 45.779 32.021	76 14.259 26.573	45 8.443 30.612	533 100.000 29.399
ASSOCIATE	29 38.158 4.693	29 38.158 3.806	12 15.789 4.196	6 7.895 4.082	76 100.000 4.192
OTHER	55 29.570 9.900	88 47.312 11.549	31 16.667 10.839	12 6.452 8.163	186 100.000 10.259
COLUMN SUMS	618 34.087 100.000	762 42.030 100.000	286 15.775 100.000	147 8.108 100.000	1813 100.000 100.000

Table 7-12 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Institutional Control

INSTITUTIONAL					NEED FORMAL CERTIFI
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION					COLUMNS = CATION FOR FINANCIAL
					AID ADMINISTRATORS?
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	294 37.548 47.573	345 44.061 45.335	92 11.750 32.394	52 6.641 34.667	783 100.000 43.188
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	271 30.621 43.851	362 40.904 47.569	164 18.531 57.746	88 9.944 58.667	885 100.000 48.814
PROPRI- ETARY	53 36.552 8.576	54 37.241 7.096	28 19.310 9.859	10 6.897 6.667	145 100.000 7.998
COLUMN SUMS	618 34.087 100.000	761 41.975 100.000	284 15.665 100.000	150 8.274 100.000	1813 100.000 100.000

Table 7-13 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Institutional Type

INSTITUTIONAL		NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?			
ROWS = TYPE		COLUMNS =			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
VOC.	64	59	28	8	159
TECH.	40.252	37.107	17.610	5.031	100.000
	10.667	7.973	10.036	5.479	9.008
2 YEARS	135	163	44	13	355
& UNDER	38.028	45.915	12.394	3.662	100.000
NOT V.T.	22.500	22.027	15.771	8.904	20.113
4 YEAR	145	189	74	32	440
	32.955	42.955	16.818	7.273	100.000
	24.167	25.541	26.523	21.918	24.929
4 YEAR	221	262	104	64	651
AND	33.948	40.246	15.975	9.831	100.000
BEYOND	36.833	35.405	37.276	43.836	36.884
NURSING	11	13	4	7	35
	31.429	37.143	11.429	20.000	100.000
	1.813	1.757	1.434	4.795	1.983
GRAD/ PROFES.	24	54	25	22	125
ONLY	19.200	43.200	20.000	17.600	100.000
	4.000	7.297	8.961	15.068	7.082
COLUMN SUMS	600	740	279	146	1765
	33.994	41.926	15.807	8.272	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 7-14 There Should be Certification of Aid Administrators by Geographic Area

REGIONAL		NEED FORMAL CERTIFICATION FOR FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS?			
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES		COLUMNS =			
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	156	197	91	53	497
	31.388	39.638	18.310	10.664	100.000
	25.532	26.024	12.500	16.054	27.688
SASFAA	109	119	37	15	280
	38.929	42.500	13.214	5.357	100.000
	17.840	15.720	13.214	10.204	15.599
MASFAA	170	243	81	47	541
	31.421	44.917	14.972	8.688	100.000
	27.823	32.100	28.929	31.973	30.139
SWASFAA	72	62	25	8	167
	43.114	37.126	14.970	4.790	100.000
	11.784	8.190	8.929	5.442	9.304
RNASFAA	26	43	12	4	85
	30.588	50.588	14.118	4.706	100.000
	4.255	5.680	4.286	2.721	4.735
WASFAA	78	93	34	20	225
	34.667	41.333	15.111	8.889	100.000
	12.766	12.285	12.143	13.605	12.535
COLUMN SUMS	611	757	280	147	1795
	34.039	42.173	15.599	8.189	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section D

Office Characteristics

TABLES 8-1 Through 8-13 Staff Size and Adequacy of Staff

Tables 8-1 through 8-3 display office staffing patterns for the following positions: professional, clerical, and student assistants. If the number of respondents in an institutional category exceeded 100, the category was further divided by institutional size. Responses are only included from respondents indicating that they work in the "central" financial aid office on their campus.

It was originally anticipated that staffing patterns would be compared with the "size of the setting" in which the respondent worked (branch campus, central campus, academic department, etc.). However, over 59 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey did not indicate "size of setting." As a result, the following tables compare "staff size" with "institutional size" for respondents stating that they are employed in the "central" financial aid office on their campus. Although this approach produces a number of anomalies, it produces accurate results for the majority of the respondents. It should also be noted that a number of respondents apparently included other staff members, besides those in the Financial Aid Office in their staff size. As a result, several respondents state that they are employed at small institutions and yet they have staffs that would be more appropriate for larger institutions. At the other extreme, some respondents from large institutions replied that they had either no staff or very small staffs. Many of these respondents are probably employed in staff positions above the Financial Aid Office and may have only reported the Director of Financial Aid as someone reporting to them. In summary, the figures on staff size are questionable for several reasons and responses which are extremely high or low should, in all probability, be deleted. However, if the figures are interpreted carefully, they do provide a reasonable approximation of staffing patterns.

Table 8-1 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Professional Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

		SIZE OF FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFF								ROW SUMS
ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE		NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+	
PUBLIC		2	1	34	41	5	1			84
4 YEAR+		2.381	1.190	40.476	48.810	5.952	1.190			100.000
<7000		6.897	3.226	6.104	13.487	4.630	2.273			7.602
PUBLIC				4	39	42	9	1	1	96
4 YEAR+				4.167	40.625	43.750	9.375	1.042	1.042	100.000
7-19999				0.718	12.829	38.889	20.455	5.882	6.667	8.688
PUBLIC		3		1	6	12	13	10	8	53
4 YEAR+		5.660		1.887	11.321	22.642	24.528	18.868	15.094	100.000
20,000+		10.345		0.180	1.974	11.111	29.545	58.824	53.333	4.796
PUBLIC				20	17					31
4 YEAR				64.516	35.484					100.000
<4000				3.591	3.618					2.805
PUBLIC				4	8	9	2	1		24
4 YEAR				16.667	33.333	37.500	8.333	4.167		100.000
4,000+				0.718	2.632	8.333	4.545	5.882		2.172
PUBLIC		6		50	11					67
2 YEAR		8.955		74.627	16.418					100.000
<4000		20.690		8.977	3.618					6.063
PUBLIC		2		37	25	7	2			73
2 YEAR		2.740		50.685	34.247	9.589	2.740			100.000
4,000+		6.897		6.643	8.224	6.481	4.545			6.606
PUBLIC,				3	3					6
GRAD/				50.000	50.000					100.000
PROF				0.539	0.987					0.543
INDEP		2	6	58	36	4	2			108
4 YEAR+		1.852	5.556	53.704	33.333	3.704	1.852			100.000
<4000		6.897	19.355	10.413	11.842	3.704	4.545			9.774
INDEP				6	29	21	13	4	3	76
4 YEAR+				7.895	38.158	27.632	17.105	5.263	3.947	100.000
4,000+				1.077	9.539	19.444	29.545	23.529	20.000	6.878
INDEP		3	6	103	19					131
4 YEAR		2.290	4.580	78.626	14.504					100.000
<1000		10.345	19.355	18.492	6.250					11.855
INDEP		3	5	78	29	2				117
4 YEAR		2.564	4.274	66.667	24.786	1.709				100.000
1-1,999		10.345	16.129	14.004	9.539	1.852				10.588
INDEP			1	20	14	2				37
4 YEAR			2.703	54.054	37.838	5.405				100.000
2,000+			3.226	3.591	4.605	1.852				3.348
INDEP		1	2	34	3			1		41
2 YEAR		2.439	4.878	82.927	7.317			2.439		100.000
		3.448	6.452	6.104	0.987			5.882		3.710
INDEP		1	1	16	3					21
GRAD/		4.762	4.762	76.190	14.286					100.000
PROP		3.448	3.226	2.873	0.987					1.900
PUBLIC		1		10						11
INDEP		9.091		90.909						100.000
NURSING		3.448		1.795						0.995
PUBLIC		1	2	25	6		1			35
INDEP		2.857	5.714	71.429	17.143		2.857			100.000
VOC.TEC		3.448	6.452	4.488	1.974		2.273			3.167
PROPRI.		2	4	33	14	2	1		2	58
VOC.TEC		3.448	6.877	56.897	24.138	3.448	1.724		3.448	100.000
		6.897	12.903	5.925	4.605	1.852	2.273		13.333	5.249
ALL		2	3	21	7	2			1	36
OTHER		5.556	8.333	58.333	19.444	5.556			2.778	100.000
PROPRI.		6.897	9.677	3.770	2.303	1.852			6.667	3.258
COLUMN		29	31	557	304	108	44	17	15	1105
SUMS		2.624	2.805	50.407	27.511	9.774	3.982	1.538	1.357	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-2 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Clerical Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE		SIZE OF FULL-TIME CLERICAL STAFF								ROW SUMS
	NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+		
PUBLIC	2	3	24	42	12	1				84
4 YEAR+	2.381	3.571	28.571	50.000	14.286	1.190				100.000
<7000	2.532	4.348	5.381	13.816	9.677	3.030				7.616
PUBLIC	1		3	23	52	8	8			95
4 YEAR+	1.053		3.158	24.211	54.737	8.421	8.421			100.000
7-19999	1.266		0.673	7.566	41.935	24.242	26.667			8.613
PUBLIC	3			6	6	11	14	12		52
4 YEAR+	5.769			11.538	11.538	21.154	26.923	23.077		100.000
20,000+	3.797			1.974	4.839	33.333	46.667	66.667		4.714
PUBLIC		3	16	9	3					31
4 YEAR		9.677	51.613	29.032	9.677					100.000
<4000		4.348	3.587	2.961	2.419					2.811
PUBLIC			5	9	7	2	1			24
4 YEAR			20.833	37.500	29.167	8.333	4.167			100.000
4,000+			1.121	2.961	5.645	6.061	3.333			2.176
PUBLIC	4	3	42	17	1					67
2 YEAR	5.970	4.478	62.687	25.373	1.493					100.000
<4000	5.063	4.348	9.417	5.592	0.806					6.074
PUBLIC	3	1	19	36	10	2	2			73
2 YEAR	4.110	1.370	26.027	49.315	13.699	2.740	2.740			100.000
4,000+	3.797	1.449	4.260	11.842	8.065	6.061	6.667			6.618
PUBLIC, GRAD/PROF		1	4	1						6
		16.667	66.667	16.667						100.000
		1.449	0.897	0.329						0.544
INDEP	6	5	64	30	2	1				108
4 YEAR+	5.556	4.630	59.259	27.778	1.852	0.926				100.000
<4000	7.595	7.246	14.350	9.868	1.613	3.030				9.791
INDEP		1	10	25	21	8	5	6		76
4 YEAR+		1.316	13.158	32.895	27.632	10.526	6.579	7.895		100.000
4,000+		1.449	2.242	8.224	16.935	24.242	16.667	33.333		6.890
INDEP	25	12	79	12	3					131
4 YEAR	19.084	9.160	60.305	9.160	2.290					100.000
<1000	31.646	17.391	17.713	3.947	2.419					11.877
INDEP	6	6	68	35	2					117
4 YEAR	5.128	5.128	58.120	29.915	1.709					100.000
1-1,999	7.595	8.696	15.247	11.513	1.613					10.607
INDEP	1		21	15						37
4 YEAR	2.703		56.757	40.541						100.000
2,000+	1.266		4.709	4.934						3.354
INDEP	6	8	20	7						41
2 YEAR	14.634	19.512	48.780	17.073						100.000
	7.595	11.594	4.484	2.303						3.717
INDEP	2	1	15	3						21
GRAD/PROF	9.524	4.762	71.429	14.286						100.000
	2.532	1.449	3.363	0.987						1.904
PUBLIC	1	3	6	1						11
INDEP	9.091	27.273	54.545	9.091						100.000
NURSING	1.266	4.348	1.345	0.329						0.997
PUBLIC		6	16	12	1					35
INDEP		17.143	45.714	34.286	2.857					100.000
VOC.TEC		8.696	3.587	3.947	0.806					3.173
PROPRI.	11	12	20	11	4					58
VOC.TEC	18.966	20.690	34.483	18.966	6.897					100.000
	13.924	17.391	4.484	3.618	3.226					5.258
ALL	8	4	14	10						36
OTHER	22.222	11.111	38.889	27.778						100.000
PROPRI.	10.127	5.797	3.139	3.289						3.264
COLUMN SUMS	79	69	446	304	124	33	30	18		1103
	7.162	6.256	40.435	27.561	11.242	2.992	2.720	1.632		100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000

Table 8-3 Size of Full-Time Equivalent Student Staff by Institutional Type, Control, and Size

ROWS = ITS: INSTITUTIONAL TYPE AND SIZE COLUMNS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME STUDENT ASSISTANTS STAFF

	NONE	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20+	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	4	8	15	22	27	4	3	1	84
4 YEAR+	4.762	9.524	17.857	26.190	32.143	4.762	3.571	1.190	100.000
<7000	2.597	4.469	6.944	7.358	19.708	8.889	6.383	4.167	7.629
PUBLIC	3	1	6	28	19	18	16	5	96
4 YEAR+	3.125	1.042	6.250	29.167	19.792	18.750	16.667	5.208	100.000
7-19999	1.948	0.559	2.778	9.365	13.869	40.000	34.043	20.833	8.719
PUBLIC	3	1	2	5	10	5	13	11	50
4 YEAR+	6.000	2.000	4.000	10.000	20.000	10.000	26.000	22.000	100.000
20,000+	1.948	0.559	0.926	1.672	7.299	11.111	27.660	45.833	4.541
PUBLIC	2	3	4	13	9				31
4 YEAR	6.452	9.677	12.903	41.935	29.032				100.000
<4000	1.299	1.676	1.852	4.348	6.569				2.816
PUBLIC		1	2	7	8	3	2	1	24
4 YEAR		4.167	8.333	29.167	33.333	12.500	8.333	4.167	100.000
4,000+		0.559	0.926	2.341	5.839	6.667	4.255	4.167	2.180
PUBLIC	13	12	17	20	4		1		67
2 YEAR	19.403	17.910	25.373	29.851	5.970		1.493		100.000
<4000	8.442	6.704	7.870	6.689	2.920		2.128		6.085
PUBLIC	7	5	11	32	13	1		4	73
2 YEAR	9.589	6.849	15.068	43.836	17.808	1.370		5.479	100.000
4,000+	4.545	2.793	5.093	10.702	9.489	2.222		16.667	6.630
PUBLIC	2	4							6
GRAD/	33.333	66.667							100.000
PROF	1.299	2.235							0.545
INDEP	15	14	28	40	9	1	1		108
4 YEAR+	13.889	12.963	25.926	37.037	8.333	0.926	0.926		100.000
<4000	9.740	7.821	12.963	13.378	6.569	2.222	2.128		9.809
INDEP	6	4	13	23	14	8	5	2	75
4 YEAR+	8.000	5.333	17.333	30.667	18.667	10.667	6.667	2.667	100.000
4,000+	1.896	2.235	6.019	7.692	10.219	17.778	10.639	8.333	6.812
INDEP	24	21	43	33	5	2	3		131
4 YEAR	18.321	16.031	32.824	25.191	3.817	1.527	2.290		100.000
<1000	15.584	11.732	19.907	11.037	3.650	4.444	6.383		11.898
INDEP	14	23	32	40	6	1	1		117
4 YEAR	11.966	19.658	27.350	34.188	5.128	0.855	0.855		100.000
1-1,999	9.091	12.849	14.815	13.378	4.380	2.222	2.128		10.627
INDEP	3	2	10	16	4	1	1		37
4 YEAR	8.108	5.405	27.027	43.243	10.811	2.703	2.703		100.000
2,000+	1.948	1.117	4.630	5.351	2.920	2.222	2.128		3.361
INDEP	7	12	12	7	2	1			41
2 YEAR	17.073	29.268	29.268	17.073	4.878	2.439			100.000
	4.545	6.704	5.556	2.341	1.460	2.222			3.724
INDEP	6	6	3	4	2				21
GRAD/	28.571	28.571	14.286	19.048	9.524				100.000
PROF	3.896	3.352	1.389	1.338	1.460				1.907
PUBLIC	6	5							11
INDEP	54.545	45.455							100.000
NURSING	3.896	2.793							0.999
PUBLIC	5	13	10	3	3		1		35
INDEP	14.286	37.143	28.571	8.571	8.571		2.857		100.000
VOC.TEC	3.247	7.263	4.630	1.003	2.190		2.128		3.179
PROPRI.	24	24	5	4	1				58
VOC.TEC	41.379	41.379	8.621	6.897	1.724				100.000
	15.584	13.408	2.315	1.338	0.730				5.268
ALL	10	20	3	2	1				36
OTHER	27.778	55.556	8.333	5.556	2.778				100.000
PROPRI.	6.494	11.173	1.389	0.669	0.730				3.270
COLUMN SUMS	154	179	216	299	137	45	47	24	1101
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-4 Professional Staff Size by
Adequacy of Staff by
Institutional Size (Under 1,000)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = UNDER 1000					
SIZE OF FULL-TIME ROWS = PROFESSIONAL STAFF					
COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1 9.091 1.515	6 54.545 5.310	1 9.091 1.163	3 27.273 4.167	11 100.000 3.264
1	2 11.111 3.030	6 33.333 5.310	5 27.778 5.814	5 27.778 6.944	18 100.000 5.341
2-3	4 18.577 71.212	8 32.016 71.681	6 26.087 76.744	5 23.320 81.944	253 100.000 75.074
4-6	13 27.660 19.697	17 36.170 15.044	12 25.532 13.953	5 10.638 6.944	47 100.000 13.947
7-9		2 100.000 1.770			2 100.000 0.593
10-14	1 50.000 1.515	1 50.000 0.885			2 100.000 0.593
15-19	1 100.000 1.515				1 100.000 0.297
20+	1 33.333 1.515		2 66.667 2.326		3 100.000 0.890
COL SUMS	66 19.585 100.000	113 33.531 100.000	86 25.519 100.000	72 21.365 100.000	337 100.000 100.000

Table 8-5 Professional Staff Size by
Adequacy of Staff by
Institutional Size
(1,000-3,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 1000- 3999					
SIZE OF FULL-TIME ROWS = PROFESSIONAL STAFF					
COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1 9.091 3.125	7 63.636 5.344	3 27.273 2.857		11 100.000 2.842
1		4 33.333 3.053	5 41.667 4.762	3 25.000 2.521	12 100.000 3.101
2-3	13 5.579 40.625	66 28.326 50.382	65 27.897 61.905	89 38.197 74.790	233 100.000 60.207
4-6	12 10.169 37.500	48 40.678 36.641	31 26.271 29.524	27 22.881 22.689	118 100.000 30.491
7-9	5 45.455 15.625	5 45.455 3.817	1 9.091 0.952		11 100.000 2.842
10-14	1 50.000 3.125	1 50.000 0.763			2 100.000 0.517
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	32 8.269 100.000	131 33.850 100.000	105 27.132 100.000	119 30.749 100.000	387 100.000 100.000

Table 8-6 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (4,000-9,999)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 4000-
9999

SIZE OF FULL-TIME
ROWS = PROFESSIONAL
STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	1 33.333 4.545		2 66.667 3.125		3 100.000 1.389
1	1 100.000 4.545				1 100.000 0.463
2-3	3 5.000 13.636	14 23.333 24.561	14 23.333 21.875	29 48.333 39.726	60 100.000 27.778
4-6	8 7.921 36.364	26 25.743 45.614	35 34.653 54.688	32 31.683 43.836	101 100.000 46.759
7-9	6 13.953 27.273	14 32.558 24.561	12 27.907 18.750	11 25.581 15.068	43 100.000 19.907
10-14	3 37.500 11.636	3 37.500 5.263	1 12.500 1.563	1 12.500 1.370	8 100.000 3.704
15-19					
20+					
COL SUMS	22 10.185 100.000	57 26.389 100.000	64 29.630 100.000	73 33.796 100.000	216 100.000 100.000

Table 8-7 Professional Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (10,000-19,999)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 10,000-
19,999

SIZE OF FULL-TIME
ROWS = PROFESSIONAL
STAFF

COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE					
1				1 100.000 2.041	1 100.000 0.763
2-3	5 18.519 33.333	8 29.630 22.857	3 11.111 9.375	11 40.741 22.449	27 100.000 20.611
4-6	4 10.000 26.667	9 22.500 25.714	12 30.000 37.500	15 37.500 30.612	40 100.000 30.534
7-9	1 2.439 6.667	8 19.512 22.857	14 34.146 43.750	18 43.902 36.735	41 100.000 31.298
10-14	3 17.647 20.000	8 47.059 22.857	3 17.647 9.375	3 17.647 6.122	17 100.000 12.977
15-19	2 50.000 13.333	1 25.000 2.857		1 25.000 2.041	4 100.000 3.053
20+		1 100.000 2.857			1 100.000 0.763
COL SUMS	15 11.450 100.000	35 26.718 100.000	32 24.427 100.000	49 37.405 100.000	131 100.000 100.000

Table 8-8 Professional Staff Size
by Adequacy of Staff by
Institutional Size
(20,000 and over)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 20,000+

ROWS = SIZE OF FULL-TIME
PROFESSIONAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE		1 50.000 3.704	1 50.000 5.000		2 100.000 2.817
1					
2-3		2 33.333 7.407	2 33.333 10.000	2 33.333 11.765	6 100.000 8.451
4-6	1 9.091 14.286	4 36.364 14.815	2 18.182 10.000	4 36.364 23.529	11 100.000 15.493
7-9	2 14.286 28.571	4 28.571 14.815	4 28.571 20.000	4 28.571 23.529	14 100.000 19.718
10-14	4 26.667 57.143	5 33.333 18.519	5 33.333 25.000	1 6.667 5.882	15 100.000 21.127
15-19		5 41.667 18.519	4 33.333 20.000	3 25.000 17.647	12 100.000 16.901
20+		6 54.545 22.222	2 18.182 10.000	3 27.273 17.647	11 100.000 15.493
COL SUMS	7 9.859 100.000	27 38.028 100.000	20 28.169 100.000	17 23.944 100.000	71 100.000 100.000

Table 8-9 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (Under 1,000)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = UNDER 1000					
SIZE OF FULL-TIME ROWS = CLERICAL STAFF					
COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	11	20	13	9	53
	20.755	37.736	24.528	16.981	100.000
	16.667	17.857	15.116	12.500	15.774
1	4	8	12	26	50
	8.000	16.000	24.000	52.000	100.000
	6.061	7.143	13.953	36.111	14.881
2-3	35	66	53	31	185
	18.919	35.676	28.649	16.757	100.000
	53.030	58.929	61.628	43.056	55.060
4-6	14	16	5	6	41
	34.146	39.024	12.195	14.634	100.000
	21.212	14.286	5.814	8.333	12.202
7-9	2	2	3		7
	28.571	28.571	42.857		100.000
	1.030	1.786	3.488		2.083
10-14					
15-19					
20+					
COL	66	112	86	72	336
SUMS	19.641	33.333	25.595	21.429	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-10 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (1,000-3,999)

INSTITUTIONAL SIZE = 1000- 3999					
SIZE OF FULL-TIME ROWS = CLERICAL STAFF					
COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF ADEQUATE?					
	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE	2	7	5	6	20
	10.000	35.000	25.000	30.000	100.000
	6.250	5.344	4.762	5.042	5.168
1			5	10	15
			33.333	66.667	100.000
			4.762	8.403	3.876
2-3	18	65	54	78	215
	8.372	30.233	25.116	36.279	100.000
	56.250	49.618	51.429	65.546	55.556
4-6	7	53	39	25	126
	7.143	42.063	30.952	19.841	100.000
	28.125	40.458	37.143	21.008	32.558
7-9	2	6	2		10
	20.000	60.000	20.000		100.000
	6.250	4.580	1.905		2.584
10-14	1				1
	100.000				100.000
	3.125				0.258
15-19					
20+					
COL	32	131	105	119	387
SUMS	8.269	33.850	27.132	30.749	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 8-11 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (4,000-9,999)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 4000-
9999

SIZE OF FULL-TIME
ROWS = CLERICAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE			1 33.333 1.563	2 66.667 2.740	3 100.000 1.389
1	1 33.333 4.545			2 66.667 2.740	3 100.000 1.389
2-3	2 4.651 9.091	13 30.233 22.807	7 16.279 10.938	21 48.837 28.767	43 100.000 19.907
4-6	11 10.891 50.000	24 23.762 42.105	32 31.683 50.000	34 33.663 46.575	101 100.000 46.759
7-9	6 10.909 27.273	16 29.091 28.070	21 38.182 32.813	12 21.818 16.438	55 100.000 25.463
10-14	1 11.111 4.545	4 44.444 7.018	3 33.333 4.688	1 11.111 1.370	9 100.000 4.167
15-19	1 50.000 4.545			1 50.000 1.370	2 100.000 0.926
20+					
COL SUMS	22 10.185 100.000	57 26.389 100.000	64 29.630 100.000	73 33.796 100.000	216 100.000 100.000

Table 8-12 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy of Staff by Institutional Size (10,000-19,999)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 10,000-
19,999

SIZE OF FULL-TIME
ROWS = CLERICAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE			1 33.333 6.667	2 66.667 6.250	3 100.000 2.308
1				2 100.000 4.082	2 100.000 1.538
2-3	4 23.529 26.667	5 29.412 14.706	1 5.882 3.125	7 41.176 14.286	17 100.000 13.077
4-6	2 5.714 13.333	9 25.714 26.471	10 28.571 31.250	14 40.000 28.571	35 100.000 26.923
7-9	3 6.250 20.000	13 27.083 38.235	16 33.333 50.000	16 33.333 32.653	48 100.000 36.923
10-14	1 9.091 6.667	2 18.182 5.882	1 9.091 3.125	7 63.636 14.286	11 100.000 8.462
15-19	3 27.273 20.000	3 27.273 8.824	2 18.182 6.250	3 27.273 6.122	11 100.000 8.462
20+	1 33.333 6.667	2 66.667 5.882			3 100.000 2.308
COL SUMS	15 11.538 100.000	34 26.154 100.000	32 24.615 100.000	49 37.692 100.000	130 100.000 100.000

Table 8-13 Clerical Staff Size by Adequacy
of Staff by Institutional Size
(20,000 and over)

INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE = 20,000+

SIZE OF FULL-TIME
ROWS = CLERICAL STAFF COLUMNS = SIZE OF STAFF
ADEQUATE?

	STRONG- LY AGREE	MODER- ATELY AGREE	MODER. DIS- AGREE	STRONG- LY DIS- AGREE	ROW SUMS
NONE		1 100.000 3.846			1 100.000 1.429
1					
2-3	1 25.000 14.286		1 25.000 5.000	2 50.000 11.765	4 100.000 5.714
4-6	1 7.692 14.286	6 46.154 23.077	2 15.385 10.000	4 30.769 23.529	13 100.000 18.571
7-9		5 55.556 19.231	2 22.222 10.000	2 22.222 11.765	9 100.000 12.857
10-14	2 18.182 28.571	3 27.273 11.538	4 36.364 20.000	2 18.182 11.765	11 100.000 15.714
15-19	2 11.765 28.571	1 5.882 3.846	10 58.824 50.000	4 23.529 23.529	17 100.000 24.286
20+	1 6.667 14.286	10 66.667 38.462	1 6.667 5.000	3 20.000 17.647	15 100.000 21.429
COL	7	26	20	17	70
SUMS	10.000 100.000	37.143 100.000	28.571 100.000	24.286 100.000	100.000 100.000

TABLES 9-1 Through 9-3 "What is the Title of Your Immediate Supervisor?"*

Directors of financial aid reported a wide variety of immediate supervisors. As seen in Tables 9-1, 9-2, and 9-3, reporting arrangements tend to vary by type of institution and by institutional size.

Directors at small institutions (under 1,000 students) were more likely to report directly to the President or Chancellor than were those at other institutions.

Among Directors from public institutions (Table 9-1), the most common reporting arrangement was to the Dean of Students (38.4%), followed by the Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor of Student Affairs (28.9%). At private institutions (Table 9-2), Directors were more likely to report to the Vice-President or Vice-Chancellor for Business Affairs (19.3%) than were Directors at public institutions.

Directors at proprietary institutions (Table 9-3) were more likely to report directly to the President than were Directors at other types of institutions.

*Respondents were given a choice of 15 supervisor's titles to select. Very few responses (less than 1%) were made in several of the title categories. Therefore, a number of the little-used categories were collapsed into related categories:

1. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs/Treasurer includes Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Business Affairs as well as Controllers/Comptrollers.
2. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs includes Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Academic Affairs as well as Deans of Academic Affairs.
3. Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Student Affairs includes Associate/Assistant Chancellors and Associate/Assistant Vice-Presidents for Student Affairs.

Table 9-1 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Public Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: = PUBLIC

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = SIZE

COLUMNS = TITLE OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

	PRES. OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS. AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD. AF.	VICE-CH OR V.P. STUD. AF.	DEAN OF STUDENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS. & FIN. AID	DIR. OF ADMIS- SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI- STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	8 21.053 32.000	2 5.263 9.091	1 2.632 10.000	2 5.263 1.449	9 23.684 4.918		1 2.632 14.286		15 39.474 17.647	38 100.000 7.983
1000-3999	10 8.065 40.000	5 4.032 22.727	1 0.806 10.000	23 18.548 16.667	65 52.419 35.519		1 0.806 14.286		19 15.323 22.353	124 100.000 26.050
4000-9999	4 2.649 16.000	12 7.947 54.545	4 2.649 40.000	50 33.113 36.232	52 34.437 28.415	2 1.325 66.667	3 1.987 42.857	2 1.325 66.667	22 14.570 25.882	151 100.000 31.723
10,000-19,999	3 3.191 12.090	2 2.128 9.091	1 1.064 10.000	40 42.553 28.986	35 37.234 19.126	1 1.064 33.333			12 12.766 14.118	94 100.000 19.748
20,000+		1 1.449 4.545	3 4.348 30.000	23 33.333 16.667	22 31.884 12.022		2 2.899 28.571	1 1.449 33.333	17 24.638 20.000	69 100.000 14.496
COLUMN SUMS	25 5.252 100.000	22 4.622 100.000	10 2.101 100.000	138 28.992 100.000	183 38.445 100.000	3 0.630 100.000	7 1.471 100.000	3 0.630 100.000	85 17.857 100.000	476 100.000

Table 9-2 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Independent Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION = INDEP. (INDEPENDENT)

TITLE = DIRECTOR

ROWS = SIZE

COLUMNS = TITLE OF IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR

SHORT CODE

	PRES. OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS. AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD. AF.	VICE-CH OR V.P. STUD. AF.	DEAN OF STUDENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS. & FIN. AID	DIR. OF ADMIS- SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI- STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	4 19.731 58.667	4 18.386 36.937	18 8.072 48.649	7 3.139 12.069	37 16.592 36.275	2 0.897 9.091	25 11.211 59.524	5 2.242 83.333	4 19.731 36.066	221 100.000 38.783
1000-3999	28 11.316 37.333	54 21.862 48.649	13 5.263 15.135	24 9.717 41.379	56 22.672 54.902	11 4.453 50.000	15 6.073 35.714	1 0.405 16.667	45 18.219 36.885	247 100.000 42.957
4000-9999	3 4.688 4.000	7 10.938 6.106	4 6.250 10.811	17 26.563 29.310	8 12.500 7.843	3 4.688 13.636	1 1.563 2.381		21 32.813 17.213	64 100.000 11.130
10,000-19,999		8 22.222 7.207	2 5.556 5.405	10 27.778 17.241	1 2.778 0.980	5 13.889 22.727	1 2.778 2.381		9 25.000 7.377	36 100.000 6.261
20,000+		1 20.000 0.901				1 20.000 4.545			3 60.000 2.459	5 100.000 0.870
COLUMN SUMS	75 13.043 100.000	111 14.304 100.000	37 6.435 100.000	58 10.087 100.000	102 17.739 100.000	22 3.826 100.000	42 7.304 100.000	6 1.043 100.000	122 21.217 100.000	575 100.000

Table 9-3 Title of Immediate Supervisor for Directors of Financial Aid at Proprietary Institutions by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL
CLASSIFICATION: = PROPRI-
ETARY

TITLE = DIREC-
TOR

INSTITUTIONAL		TITLE OF								
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR								
	PRES. OR CHANC.	VICE-CH OR V.P. BUS. AF.	VICE-CH OR VP ACAD. AF.	VICE CH OR V.P. STUD. AF.	DEAN OF STUDENTS	DI/DEAN ADMIS. & FIN. AID	DIR. OF ADMIS- SIONS	MGR./ ADMINI- STRATOR	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	47	1	1	2	1		1	9	16	78
	60.256	1.282	1.282	2.564	1.282		1.282	11.538	20.513	100.000
	87.037	33.333	100.000	50.000	25.000		100.000	100.000	88.889	82.979
1000-3999	6	1		2	2				2	13
	46.154	7.692		15.385	15.385				15.385	100.000
	11.111	33.333		50.000	50.000				11.111	13.830
4000-9999		1								1
		100.000								100.000
		33.333								1.064
10,000-19,999	1				1					2
	50.000				50.000					100.000
	1.852				25.000					2.128
20,000+										
COLUMN SUMS	54	3	1	4	4		1	9	18	94
	57.447	3.191	1.064	4.255	4.255		1.064	9.574	19.149	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 10-1 Through 10-3 Office Responsibility for Student Employment

Approximately one-third of the respondents fell into each of the following two categories:

...office is responsible for both finding positions for College Work-Study students and placing them in these positions

...office is responsible for finding positions and/or placing students in positions for both the CWS program and other student employment programs (Table 10-1).

There were noticeable differences between the responses of individuals from proprietary schools and other groups. Respondents from proprietary schools were more likely to indicate that they had little or no responsibility for student employment or that their institution did not have a student employment program. Similarly, respondents from vocational/technical schools, nursing schools, and graduate/professional schools were more likely than other groups to indicate that they had little or no responsibility for student employment or that their institution did not have a student employment program (Table 10-2).

Table 10-3 permits the identification of several differences in responsibility for student employment based on institutional size. For example, respondents from institutions with enrollments of 10,000 or more students were approximately twice as likely to indicate that their office had little or no responsibility for student employment as were respondents from smaller institutions. Although 11.9 percent of the respondents from institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 students indicated their institution did not have a student employment program, this was the most unlikely response from individuals in all of the other size categories.

Table 10-1 Office Responsibility for Student Employment by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL				OFFICE				
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:				COLUMNS = RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT				
	FIND/ PLACE CWS	FIND POS. FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU. EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	236	18	18	196	31	5	16	520
	45.385	3.462	3.462	37.692	5.962	0.962	3.077	100.000
	47.581	56.250	40.000	41.525	22.794	7.937	17.582	38.951
INDEP. (PRT-VATE)	235	14	24	268	74	23	54	692
	33.960	2.023	3.468	38.728	10.694	3.324	7.803	100.000
	47.179	43.750	53.333	56.780	54.412	36.500	59.341	51.835
PROPRIETARY	25		3	8	31	35	21	123
	20.325		2.439	6.504	25.203	28.455	17.073	100.000
	5.040		6.667	1.695	22.794	55.556	23.077	9.213
COLUMN SUMS	496	32	45	472	136	63	91	1335
	37.154	2.397	3.371	35.356	10.187	4.719	6.816	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 10-2 Office Responsibility for Student Employment
by Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL		OFFICE						
ROWS = TYPE:		COLUMNS = RESPONSIBILITY FOR						
		STUDENT EMPLOYMENT						
	FINDE PLACE CWS	FIND POS.FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU.EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
VOC.	38		3	17	21	28	13	120
TECH.	31.667		2.500	14.167	17.500	23.333	10.833	100.000
	7.819		7.317	3.680	15.789	46.667	15.294	9.238
2 YEARS	131	4	10	67	24	9	14	259
UNDER	50.579	1.544	3.861	25.869	9.266	3.475	5.405	100.000
NOT V.T.	26.955	12.500	24.390	14.502	18.045	15.000	16.471	19.938
4 YEAR	135	7	8	171	22	2	26	371
	36.388	1.887	2.156	46.092	5.930	0.539	7.008	100.000
	27.778	21.875	19.512	37.013	16.541	3.333	30.588	28.560
4 YEAR	154	19	12	195	44	1	22	447
AND	34.452	4.251	2.685	43.624	9.843	0.224	4.922	100.000
BEYOND	31.687	59.375	29.263	42.208	33.083	1.667	25.882	34.411
NURSING	8		1		4	10		23
	34.783		4.348		17.391	43.478		100.000
	1.646		2.439		3.008	16.667		1.771
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	20	2	7	12	18	10	10	79
	25.316	2.532	8.861	15.190	22.785	12.658	12.658	100.000
	4.115	6.250	17.073	2.597	13.534	16.667	11.765	6.082
COLUMN SUMS	486	32	41	462	133	60	85	1299
	37.413	2.463	3.155	35.566	10.239	4.619	6.543	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 10-3 Office Responsibility for Student Employment
by Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL		OFFICE						
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = RESPONSIBILITY FOR						
		STUDENT EMPLOYMENT						
	FINDE PLACE CWS	FIND POS.FOR CWS	PLACE CWS	FIND/ PLACE CWS ETC	LITTLE/ NO RESP STU.EMP	NO STUD EMPLOY. PROGRAM	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	168	7	16	139	50	57	40	477
	35.220	1.468	3.354	29.140	10.482	11.950	8.386	100.000
	33.871	21.875	35.556	29.449	36.496	90.476	43.956	35.704
1000- 3999	154	8	16	165	36	5	31	415
	37.108	1.928	3.855	39.759	8.675	1.205	7.470	100.000
	31.048	25.000	35.556	34.958	26.277	7.937	34.066	31.063
4000- 9999	92	5	9	94	16		9	225
	40.889	2.222	4.000	41.778	7.111		4.000	100.000
	18.548	15.625	20.000	19.915	11.679		9.890	16.841
10,000- 19,999	48	8	3	51	23	1	8	142
	33.803	5.634	2.113	35.915	16.197	0.704	5.634	100.000
	9.677	25.000	6.667	10.805	16.788	1.587	8.791	10.629
20,000+	34	4	1	23	12		3	77
	44.156	5.195	1.299	29.870	15.584		3.896	100.000
	6.855	12.500	2.222	4.873	8.759		3.297	5.763
COLUMN SUMS	496	32	45	472	137	63	91	1336
	37.126	2.395	3.368	35.329	10.254	4.716	6.811	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 11-1 Through 11-3

"What Percentage of the Funds Administered
by Your Office are Assigned on the Basis of
Computed Financial Need?"

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents stated that all of the funds administered by their office were assigned based on financial need. Respondents from proprietary institutions were most likely to report that all of their funds were based on financial need. In the aggregate, over 81 percent of the respondents stated that 80 percent or more of their funds were assigned based on financial need (Table 11-1).

Respondents from vocational/technical schools, nursing schools, and graduate/professional schools reported the highest percentages of funds which were assigned totally based on financial need (Table 11-2).

As shown in Table 11-3, there were differences in the percentage of funds assigned on the basis of financial need based upon institutional size.

Table 11-1 Percentage of Funds Based on Need
by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL ROWS - CLASSIFICATION:		% FUNDS ADMINISTERED COLUMNS = ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED						ROW SUMS
		100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	
PUBLIC		89	245	95	37	27	38	531
		16.761	46.139	17.891	6.968	5.085	7.156	100.000
		26.727	41.952	46.569	35.238	42.857	48.101	38.816
INDEP. (TRI- VATE)		162	313	100	65	32	36	708
		22.881	44.209	14.124	9.181	4.520	5.085	100.000
		48.649	53.596	49.020	61.905	50.794	45.570	51.754
PROPRI- ETARY		82	26	9	3	4	5	129
		61.566	20.155	6.977	2.326	3.101	3.876	100.000
		24.625	4.452	4.412	2.857	6.349	6.329	9.430
COLUMN SUMS		333	584	204	105	63	79	1368
		24.342	42.690	14.912	7.675	4.605	5.775	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 11-2 Percentage of Funds Based on Need by Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL		% FUNDS ADMINISTERED					
ROWS = TYPE:		COLUMNS = ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED					
	100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	ROW SUMS
VOC.	67	37	11	1	3	8	127
TECH.	52.756	29.134	8.661	0.787	2.362	6.299	100.000
	20.872	6.514	5.446	0.971	4.839	10.390	9.527
2 YEARS	76	123	35	14	4	10	262
6 UNDER	29.008	46.947	13.359	5.344	1.527	3.817	100.000
NOT V.T.	23.676	21.655	17.327	13.592	6.452	12.987	19.655
4 YEAR	59	180	69	36	22	15	381
	15.486	47.244	18.110	9.449	5.774	3.937	100.000
	18.380	31.690	34.158	34.951	35.484	19.481	28.582
4 YEAR	63	199	81	47	30	38	458
AND	13.755	43.450	17.686	10.262	6.550	8.297	100.000
BEYOND	19.626	35.035	40.099	45.631	48.387	49.351	34.359
NURSING	13	9	1		1		24
	54.167	37.500	4.167		4.167		100.000
	4.050	1.585	0.495		1.613		1.800
GRAD/	43	20	5	5	2	6	81
PROFES.	53.086	24.691	6.173	6.173	2.469	7.407	100.000
ONLY	13.396	3.521	2.475	4.854	3.226	7.792	6.077
COLUMN SUMS	321	568	202	103	62	77	1333
	24.081	42.611	15.154	7.727	4.651	5.776	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 11-3 Percentage of Funds Based on Need by Institutional Size

INSTITUTIONAL		% FUNDS ADMINISTERED					
ROWS = SIZE		COLUMNS = ASSIGNED BY COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED					
	100%	90-99	80-89	70-79	60-69	UNDER 60%	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	185	177	56	34	17	26	495
	37.374	35.758	11.313	6.869	3.434	5.253	100.000
	55.556	30.308	27.317	32.075	26.984	32.911	36.131
1000-3999	91	194	67	34	19	19	424
	21.462	45.755	15.802	8.019	4.481	4.481	100.000
	27.327	33.219	32.683	32.075	30.159	24.051	30.949
4000-9999	22	107	42	19	14	21	225
	9.778	47.556	18.667	8.444	6.222	9.333	100.000
	6.607	18.322	20.488	17.925	22.222	26.582	16.423
10,000-19,999	21	73	21	13	10	10	148
	14.189	49.324	14.189	8.784	6.757	6.757	100.000
	6.306	12.500	10.244	12.264	15.873	12.658	10.803
20,000+	14	33	19	6	3	3	78
	17.949	42.308	24.359	7.692	3.846	3.846	100.000
	4.204	5.651	9.268	5.660	4.762	3.797	5.693
COLUMN SUMS	333	584	205	106	63	79	1370
	24.307	42.628	14.964	7.737	4.599	5.766	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section E

External Contacts

TABLE 12-1 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Written or Called the Office of U. S. Senator or U. S. Representative Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Slightly over half of the respondents indicated that they had not contacted the office of a member of the U. S. Congress regarding a financial problem or issue during the last year. The most politically active group (6.5% of the respondents) had contacted the office of a member of Congress six or more times during the prior twelve-month period.

Table 12-1 Contacts With the Office of a Member of Congress by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED
U.S. SENATOR/CONGR.
ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	593	374	213	96	1276
	46.473	29.310	16.693	7.524	100.000
	67.234	80.603	82.558	86.486	74.402
ASSOCIATE	110	22	15	5	152
	72.368	14.474	9.868	3.289	100.000
DIRECT	12.472	4.741	5.814	4.505	8.863
FIN. AID OFFICER	95	38	17	4	154
	61.688	24.675	11.039	2.597	100.000
COUN/AD	10.771	8.190	6.589	3.604	8.980
OTHER	84	30	13	6	133
	63.158	22.556	9.774	4.511	100.000
	9.524	6.466	5.039	5.405	7.755
COLUMN SUMS	882	464	258	111	1715
	51.429	27.055	15.044	6.472	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 12-2 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Written or Called a Federal Official (DHEW/USOE) in Washington Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Approximately 75 percent of the respondents stated that they had contacted a Federal official in Washington regarding a financial aid matter in the prior 12-month period. The largest category of respondents (32.3%) had contacted a Federal official in Washington either 1 or 2 times within the past year.

Table 12-2 Contacts with a Federal Official in Washington by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED
WASHINGTON FED.OFF.
ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	300 22.883 66.225	421 32.113 73.473	374 28.528 80.258	113 8.619 77.931	103 7.857 76.296	1311 100.000 73.984
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	47 29.747 10.175	51 32.278 8.901	32 20.253 6.867	16 10.127 11.034	12 7.595 8.889	158 100.000 8.916
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	53 32.121 11.700	58 35.152 10.122	38 23.030 8.155	8 4.848 5.517	8 4.848 5.926	165 100.000 9.312
OTHER	53 38.406 11.700	43 31.159 7.504	22 15.942 4.721	8 5.797 5.517	12 8.696 8.889	138 100.000 7.788
COLUMN SUMS	453 25.564 100.000	573 32.336 100.000	466 26.298 100.000	145 8.183 100.000	135 7.619 100.000	1772 100.000

TABLE 12-3 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a Federal Official in a USOE Regional Office Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Over 88 percent of the respondents had contacted the regional Office of Education at least once in the prior twelve-month period. Approximately 37 percent of the respondents reported six or more contacts with the regional office within the prior year.

Table 12-3 Contacts with a USOE Regional Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED REGIONAL FED. OFF. ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	121 8.923 55.505	254 18.732 72.159	439 32.375 75.820	264 19.469 78.571	278 20.501 79.429	1356 100.000 73.896
ASSOC./	22 13.836	33 20.755	45 28.302	29 18.239	30 18.868	159 100.000
ASSIS. DIRECT.	10.092	9.375	7.772	8.631	8.571	8.665
FIN. AID OFFICER	32 18.182	32 18.182	64 36.364	24 13.636	24 13.636	176 100.000
COUN/AD	14.679	9.091	11.054	7.143	6.857	9.591
OTHER	43 29.861 19.725	33 22.917 9.375	31 21.528 5.354	19 13.194 5.655	18 12.500 5.143	144 100.000 7.847
COLUMN SUMS	218 11.880 100.000	352 19.183 100.000	579 31.553 100.000	336 18.311 100.000	350 19.074 100.000	1835 100.000

TABLE 12-4 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted the NASFAA Office in Washington Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Approximately one-fourth of the respondents had written or called the NASFAA office within the prior year.

Table 12-4 Contacts with the NASFAA Office by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED
NASFAA CENT. OFFICE
ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	928 73.651 71.994	198 15.714 80.488	86 6.825 83.495	48 3.810 84.211	1260 100.000 74.336
ASSOC./ ASSIS.	116 77.333	22 14.667	7 4.667	5 3.333	150 100.000
DIRECT.	8.999	8.943	6.796	8.772	8.850
FIN. AID OFFICER	134 87.013	16 10.390	3 1.948	1 0.649	154 100.000
COUN/AD	10.396	6.504	2.913	1.754	9.086
OTHER	111 84.733 8.611	10 7.634 4.065	7 5.344 6.796	3 2.290 5.263	131 100.000 7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1289 76.047 100.000	246 14.513 100.000	103 6.077 100.000	57 3.363 100.000	1695 100.000 100.000

TABLE 12-5 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a State Senator/State Representative Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Slightly over 60 percent of the respondents had not contacted a State Senator or Representative regarding a financial aid matter within the past year. Only 16.7 percent of the respondents had contacted a member of the State Legislature with a financial aid problem or issue three or more times within the previous twelve-month period.

Table 12-5 Contacts with a Member of a State Legislature by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED
STATE SEN./CONGR.
ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	710 57.120 69.608	301 24.216 79.420	151 12.148 78.646	81 6.516 91.011	1243 100.000 73.988
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	110 72.368 10.784	25 16.447 6.596	13 8.553 6.771	4 2.632 4.494	152 100.000 9.048
FIN.AID OFFICER COUN/AD	104 67.974 10.196	35 22.876 9.235	14 9.150 7.292		153 100.000 9.107
OTHER	96 72.727 9.412	18 13.636 4.749	14 10.606 7.292	4 3.030 4.494	132 100.000 7.857
COLUMN SUMS	1020 60.714 100.000	379 22.560 100.000	192 11.429 100.000	89 5.298 100.000	1680 100.000 100.000

TABLE 12-6 "How Many Times During the Past 12 Months Have You Contacted a State Agency Official Regarding a Financial Aid Problem or Issue?"

Over 80 percent of the respondents had contacted a State agency official on a financial aid matter within the prior twelve-month period. The most prevalent response was in the "10 and over" category with one-third of the respondents falling into this group.

Table 12-6 Contacts with a State Agency Official by Title

ROWS = TITLE
COLUMNS = NO. TIMES CONTACTED ST. AGENCY OFFICIAL ON FIN. AID PROBLEM

	NONE	1-2	3-5	6-9	10+	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	234 17.863 65.915	174 13.282 71.901	256 19.542 75.516	181 13.817 73.577	465 35.496 77.500	1310 100.000 73.513
ASSOC./ASSIS.	32 20.382	20 12.739	26 16.561	20 12.739	59 37.580	157 100.000
DIRECT.	9.014	8.264	7.670	8.130	9.833	8.810
FIN. AID OFFICER	49 28.655	30 17.544	22 12.865	29 16.959	41 23.977	171 100.000
COUN/AD	13.803	12.397	6.490	11.789	6.833	9.596
OTHER	40 27.778 11.268	18 12.500 7.438	35 24.306 10.324	16 11.111 6.504	35 24.306 5.833	144 100.000 8.081
COLUMN SUMS	355 19.921 100.000	242 13.580 100.000	339 19.024 100.000	246 13.805 100.000	600 33.670 100.000	1782 100.000

Section F

Professional Development

TABLES 13-1 Through 13-5 "If you Were Able to Attend Only one Major Conference per Year, Which one Would you Prefer?"

If respondents were constrained to only attending one major conference per year, approximately equal numbers of them would attend either their Regional Student Financial Aid Conference (39.0%) or their State Financial Aid Conference (42.3%). 12.4 percent of the respondents stated that they would attend the NASFAA Annual Conference, with Associate/Assistant Directors being the most likely to choose the NASFAA Annual Conference (Table 13-1).

Directors' responses to the above question vary by years of experience (significant at the .05 level). For example, 8.6 percent of the Directors with one year or less of experience expressed a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference as opposed to 19.6 percent of those with 16 or more years of experience (Table 13-2).

Directors from public institutions were almost twice as likely (significant at the .01 level) to express a preference for attending the NASFAA National Conference as were Directors from independent institutions (Table 13-3). Since institutional control is closely related to size, it is not surprising to find substantial differences (significant at the .01 level) in the percentage of respondents expressing a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference based upon institutional size. For example, less than 7 percent of the Directors in the under 1,000 category expressed a preference for the NASFAA Conference, while over 17 percent of the Directors from institutions in the two categories over 10,000 students expressed a preference for the NASFAA Conference (Table 13-4).

As shown in Table 13-5, Directors from universities and graduate/professional schools were the most likely to express a preference for the NASFAA Annual Conference.

Table 13-1 Which Conference Preferred by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFERRED?			
	NASFAA NAT. CONF.	REGION. CONF.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
DIRECTOR	152 11.247 65.821	540 39.244 74.380	602 44.259 77.382	75 5.451 64.655	1376 100.000 73.978
ASSOC./ASSIST.	35 21.212 15.152	74 44.848 10.193	51 30.909 6.480	5 3.030 4.310	165 100.000 8.871
FIN. AID OFFICER	27 14.935 11.694	66 36.264 9.091	72 43.407 10.018	10 5.495 8.621	182 100.000 9.785
OTHER	17 12.409 7.152	46 33.577 6.316	49 35.036 6.029	26 18.978 22.414	137 100.000 7.366
COLUMN SUMS	231 12.419 100.000	726 39.032 100.000	787 42.312 100.000	116 6.237 100.000	1860 100.000 100.000

Table 13-2 Which Conference Preferred by
Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	15 8.571 9.868	79 45.143 14.657	71 40.571 11.658	10 5.714 13.333	175 100.000 12.727
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	25 10.823 16.447	92 39.827 17.069	103 44.589 16.913	11 4.762 14.667	231 100.000 16.800
4-5 YEARS	26 9.483 17.105	98 35.766 18.182	138 50.365 22.660	12 4.380 16.000	274 100.000 19.927
6-10 YEARS	56 12.500 36.842	161 35.938 29.870	202 45.089 33.169	29 6.473 38.667	448 100.000 32.582
11-15 YEARS	20 10.204 13.158	86 43.878 15.955	83 42.347 13.629	7 3.571 9.333	196 100.000 14.255
16+ YEARS	10 19.608 6.579	23 45.098 4.267	12 23.529 1.970	6 11.765 8.000	51 100.000 3.709
COLUMN SUMS	152 11.055 100.000	539 39.200 100.000	609 44.291 100.000	75 5.455 100.000	1375 100.000 100.000

Table 13-3 Which Conference Preferred
by Institutional Control
(Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION: COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR CONFERENCE PREFER?

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	81 15.197 53.642	198 37.148 36.667	233 43.715 39.512	21 3.940 28.378	533 100.000 38.905
INDEP. (PRI- VATE)	58 8.192 38.411	280 39.548 51.852	326 46.045 53.884	44 6.215 59.459	708 100.000 51.679
PROPRI- ETARY	12 9.302 7.947	62 48.062 11.401	46 35.659 7.603	9 6.977 12.162	129 100.000 9.416
COLUMN SUMS	151 11.022 100.000	540 39.416 100.000	605 44.161 100.000	74 5.401 100.000	1370 100.000 100.000

Table 13-4 Which Conference Preferred by
Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR
CONFERENCE PREFERRED

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	34 6.869 22.971	201 40.606 37.222	241 48.687 39.638	19 3.838 25.313	495 100.000 36.105
1000- 3999	42 9.906 28.378	157 37.028 29.074	198 46.693 32.566	27 6.368 36.000	424 100.000 30.926
4000- 9999	31 13.717 20.946	93 41.150 17.222	86 38.053 14.145	16 7.080 21.313	226 100.000 16.484
10,000- 19,999	27 18.493 18.243	56 38.356 10.370	58 39.726 9.539	5 3.425 6.667	146 100.000 10.649
20,000+	14 17.500 9.459	33 41.250 6.111	25 31.250 4.112	8 10.000 10.667	80 100.000 5.835
COLUMN SUMS	148 10.795 100.000	540 39.387 100.000	608 44.347 100.000	75 5.470 100.000	1371 100.000 100.000

Table 13-5 Which Conference Preferred by
Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = TYPE COLUMNS = WHICH MAJOR
CONFERENCE PREFERRED

	NASFAA NAT. CONFER.	REGION. CONFER.	STATE	OTHER	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	8 6.250 5.556	55 42.969 10.476	57 44.531 9.596	8 6.250 11.111	128 100.000 9.588
2 YEARS 6 UNDER NOT V.T.	26 9.886 18.056	110 41.825 20.952	122 46.388 20.519	5 1.901 6.944	263 100.000 19.700
4 YEAR	27 7.068 18.750	148 38.743 28.190	188 49.215 31.650	19 4.974 26.349	382 100.000 28.614
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	72 15.755 50.000	174 38.074 33.143	183 40.044 30.808	28 6.127 18.889	457 100.000 34.232
NURSING		12 48.000 2.286	12 48.000 2.020	1 4.000 1.389	25 100.000 1.873
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	11 13.750 7.639	26 12.500 4.952	32 40.000 5.387	11 11.750 15.278	80 100.000 5.993
COLUMN SUMS	144 10.787 100.000	525 39.326 100.000	594 44.494 100.000	72 5.393 100.000	1335 100.000 100.000

TABLES 13-6 Through 13-9 "Does Your Institution Pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Within Your State?"

Over 95 percent of the respondents reported that their institutions were willing to pay expenses associated with attending an instate financial aid meeting (Table 13-6).

Directors' responses to the above question show no significant variance by institutional control or institutional size. The most sizable variance in responses (significant at the .01 level) is based on "kinds of students served" and whether or not the respondent's office is the central financial aid office. Directors employed in offices serving only graduate/professional students were the least likely to have their expenses covered for attendance at instate meetings (however, 81.1 percent do have their expenses covered). Directors employed in non-central financial aid offices were less likely to have their expenses covered than those employed in the central financial aid offices (79.4% vs. 97.4%).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in whether an institution would provide paid release time based on the percentage of annual employment time spent in financial aid. As employment time decreased, so too did institutional willingness to cover expenses associated with instate meetings. However, among Directors employed less than one-half time in the financial aid office, institutions were still willing to cover expenses for 88.4 percent of the respondents (Table 13-9).

Table 13-6 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	1351	49	1400	
	96.500	3.500	100.000	
	74.517	55.056	73.607	
ASSOC./	167	5	167	
ASSIS.	97.006	2.994	100.000	
DIRECT.	8.935	5.618	8.780	
FIN.AID	175	13	188	
OFFICER	91.085	6.915	100.000	
COORD/AD	9.651	14.607	9.808	
OTHER	125	22	147	
	85.034	14.966	100.000	
	6.895	24.719	7.729	
COLUMN SUMS	1813	89	1902	
	95.321	4.679	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-7 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings
by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

KINDS OF STUDENTS		INSTITUTION PAY FOR	
ROWS = SERVED		AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROP	77	18	95
ONLY	81.053	18.947	100.000
	5.725	36.735	6.815
UNDERGR	764	18	782
STUD.	97.698	2.302	100.000
ONLY	55.803	36.735	56.098
INDGRS	504	13	517
GR/PROP	97.485	2.515	100.000
	37.472	26.531	37.088
COLUMN	1345	49	1394
SUMS	96.485	3.515	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-8 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by
Central Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE?		INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1297	35	1332
	97.372	2.628	100.000
	96.288	72.917	95.484
NO	50	13	63
	79.365	20.635	100.000
	3.712	27.083	4.516
COL	1347	48	1395
SUMS	96.559	3.441	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-9 Expenses Paid for Instate Meetings by Percentage
of Employment Time (Directors)

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON FINANCIAL AID		INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEETING INSTATE: PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	776	18	794
	97.733	2.267	100.000
	57.439	36.735	56.714
75-99%	278	8	286
	97.203	2.797	100.000
	20.577	16.327	20.429
50-74%	144	3	147
	97.959	2.041	100.000
	10.659	6.122	10.500
LESS THAN	153	20	173
	88.439	11.561	100.000
HALF	11.325	40.816	12.357
COLUMN	1351	49	1400
SUMS	96.500	3.500	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-10 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Within Your State?"

As shown in Table 13-10, responses to whether an institution will provide paid release time for attendance at an instate meeting closely approximate responses to the previous question (will your institution pay your expenses for attendance at instate financial aid meetings).

Table 13-10 Paid Release Time for Instate Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR
AID MEETING INSTATE:
RELEASED TIME?

	YFS	NO	ROW SUMS
DIRFC-	1349	51	1400
TOR	96.357	3.643	100.000
	74.202	60.714	73.607
ASSOC..	161	6	167
ASSIS.	96.407	3.593	100.000
DIRECT.	8.856	7.143	8.780
FIN.AID	176	12	188
OFFICER	93.617	6.383	100.000
COUN/AD	9.681	14.286	9.884
OTHER	132	15	147
	89.796	10.204	100.000
	7.261	17.857	7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1818	84	1902
	95.584	4.416	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-11 Through 13-15 "Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Out-of-State Financial Aid Meetings?"

Approximately 83 percent of the respondents reported that their institution would pay their expenses for out-of-state financial aid meetings (Table 13-11).

Similar relationships (significant at the .01 level) were discovered in responses to this question as in the responses to the question relating to instate meetings. There was a discernible tendency for institutions to be more parsimonious with covering the expenses of Directors employed in offices serving graduate/professional students (Table 13-12), and with Directors employed in non-central financial aid offices (Table 13-13). In addition, percentage of employment time spent in the financial aid office also had the previously observed effect (Table 13-14).

There were no significant differences in Directors' responses based upon institutional size. It is interesting to note, however, that institutions with enrollments of 20,000 or more were perceived by Directors as being slightly less likely to cover out-of-state meeting expenses than institutions with enrollments of under 1,000 (Table 13-15).

Table 13-11 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by Title

ROWS = TITLE		INSTITUTION PAY FOR AID MEET. OUTSTATE PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIR- TOR	1186	214	1400	
	84.714	15.286	100.000	
	75.111	66.254	73.607	
ASSOC./ ASSIS.	143	24	167	
	85.620	14.371	100.000	
DIRECT.	9.056	7.410	8.780	
FIN.AID/ OFFICER	147	41	188	
	78.191	21.809	100.000	
COIN/AD	9.110	12.693	9.884	
OTHER	103	44	147	
	70.068	29.932	100.000	
	6.523	13.622	7.729	
COLUMN SUMS	1579	323	1902	
	83.018	16.982	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-12 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings
by Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

KINDS OF STUDENTS
ROWS = SERVED

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = AID MEET. OUTSTATE
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF	66	29	95
ONLY	69.474	30.526	100.000
	5.548	13.615	6.815
UNDERGR	663	119	782
STUD.	84.783	15.217	100.000
ONLY	56.139	55.869	56.098
UNDERGR	452	65	517
GR/PROF	87.427	12.573	100.000
	38.273	30.516	37.088
COLUMN	1181	213	1394
SUMS	84.720	15.280	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-13 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings by
Central Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL
AID OFFICE?

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = AID MEET. OUTSTATE
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1137	195	1332
	85.360	14.640	100.000
	96.193	91.549	85.484
NO	45	18	63
	71.429	28.571	100.000
	3.807	8.451	4.516
COL.	1182	213	1395
SUMS	84.731	15.269	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-14 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings
by Percentage of Employment Time in
Financial Aid (Directors)

ROWS = % TIME SPENT ON
FINANCIAL AID

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR
AID MEET. OUTSTATE
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
100%	691	103	794
	87.028	12.972	100.000
	58.263	48.131	56.714
75-99%	244	42	286
	85.315	14.685	100.000
	20.573	19.626	20.429
50-74%	124	23	147
	84.354	15.646	100.000
	10.455	10.748	10.500
LESS THAN HALF	127	46	173
	73.410	26.590	100.000
	10.708	21.495	12.357
COLUMN SUMS	1186	214	1400
	84.714	15.286	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-15 Expenses Paid for Out-of-State Meetings
by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL
SIZE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR
AID MEET. OUTSTATE
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDEP	415	92	507
1000	81.854	18.146	100.000
	35.199	42.991	36.396
1000-	366	64	430
1999	85.116	14.884	100.000
	31.043	29.907	30.869
4000-	179	27	226
9999	88.053	11.947	100.000
	16.879	12.617	16.224
10,000-	113	16	149
19,999	89.262	10.738	100.000
	11.281	7.477	10.696
20,000+	66	15	81
	81.481	18.519	100.000
	5.588	7.009	5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1179	214	1393
	84.637	15.363	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-16 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Financial Aid Meetings Outside of Your State?"

As shown in Table 13-16, institutions were slightly more likely to provide paid release time to attend out-of-state meetings (85.8%) than they were to cover expenses for such meetings (see Table 13-11). In general, similar differences to those already noted are apparent by "kinds of students served," whether or not the respondent is from the "central" financial aid office, and by percentage of employment time spent in financial aid.

Table 13-16 Paid Release Time for Out-of-State Meetings by Title

ROWS - TITLE		INSTITUTION PAY FOR COLUMNS = AID MEETING OUTSTAFF RELEASED TIME?		
		YES	NO	FOR SUMS
DIRECT-		1214	182	1400
TOP		87.000	11.000	100.000
		74.678	67.159	71.607
ASSOC./		147	20	167
ASST.		88.024	11.976	100.000
DIRECT.		9.013	7.380	9.780
FIN.AID		153	35	188
OFFICER		81.381	18.617	100.000
COUN/AD		9.181	12.915	9.884
OTHER		113	34	147
		76.871	21.129	100.000
		6.928	12.546	7.729
COLUMN		1631	271	1902
SUMS		85.752	14.248	100.000
		100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLES 13-17 Through 13-19 "Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Attendance at Workshops?"

Almost 93 percent of the respondents stated that their institution would pay their expenses for attendance at a financial aid workshop (Table 13-17).

As in a number of the previous questions, Directors were less likely (significant at the .01 level) to have their expenses covered if they worked in an office which only served graduate/professional students (Table 13-18), or in a non-central financial aid office (Table 13-19).

There were few differences to responses to the above question among Directors based upon institutional type and control.

Table 13-17 Expenses Paid for Workshops by Title

ROWS = TITLE		INSTITUTION PAY FOR COLUMNS = WORKSHOPS: PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	1108	92	1400	
	93.422	6.577	100.000	
	74.192	66.187	73.607	
ASSOC./	153	14	167	
ASSIS.	91.617	8.383	100.000	
DIRECT.	8.678	10.072	8.780	
FIN.AID	175	13	188	
OFFICER	93.085	6.915	100.000	
COUN/AD	9.926	9.353	9.884	
OTHER	127	20	147	
	86.395	13.605	100.000	
	7.204	14.388	7.729	
COLUMN	1763	139	1902	
SUMS	92.692	7.308	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-18 Expenses Paid for Workshops by
Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

KINDS OF STUDENTS
ROWS = SERVED

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = WORKSHOPS:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GP/PROF	78	17	95
ONLY	82.105	17.895	100.000
	5.986	18.681	6.815
UNDERGR	736	46	782
STUD.	94.118	5.882	100.000
ONLY	56.485	50.549	56.098
INDGPE	48	28	517
GR/PROF	94.584	5.416	100.000
	17.529	30.769	37.098
COLUMN	1103	91	1394
SUMS	93.472	6.528	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-19 Expenses Paid for Workshops by Central
Financial Aid Office (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL
AID OFFICE?

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = WORKSHOPS:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	1255	77	1332
	94.219	5.781	100.000
	96.169	45.556	95.484
NO	50	13	63
	79.365	20.635	100.000
	3.811	14.444	4.516
COL	1305	90	1395
SUMS	93.548	6.452	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-20 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Attendance at Workshops?"

Almost 95 percent of the respondents stated that their institution would provide them with paid release time for attendance at a financial aid workshop (Table 13-20).

There were no significant differences in responses to the above question among Directors of Financial Aid based upon institutional type, control, size, or whether the respondent worked in the central or a non-central aid office. As in a number of previous questions, however, respondents employed in offices serving graduate/professional students were less likely to receive paid release time than were other respondents.

Table 13-20 Paid Release Time for
Workshops by Title

TITLE	INSTITUTION PAY FOR WORKSHOPS: RELEASED TIME?	
	YES	NO
	YES	NO
DIRECTOR	1333	671
TOT	95,214	4,786
	73,932	67,677
ASSOC. AD.	157	101
ASSIST.	44,912	5,944
DIRECT.	4,708	10,101
FIN. AID	177	111
OFFICER	34,149	5,851
COUN/AD	9,417	11,111
OTHER	136	111
	22,517	7,443
	7,543	11,111
GRAD/PROF	1803	29
TOT	24,795	5,205
	100,000	100,000

TABLES 13-21 Through 13-25 'Does Your Institution pay Your Expenses for Course Work Related to Your Job?'

Less than 40 percent of the respondents stated that their institutions would pay for job-related courses (Table 13-21).

In contrast with previous questions, Directors employed in offices serving graduate/professional students and in non-central financial aid offices indicated a greater institutional willingness to pay for job-related courses than did other respondents (see Tables 13-22 and 13-23).

As shown in Table 13-24, 61.9 percent of the Directors at proprietary institutions indicated that their institutions would pay for course expenses, while respondents from both public and independent institutions reported less institutional willingness to pay for courses (significant at the .01 level).

Table 13-25 indicates the differences in willingness to pay for job-related courses based upon institutional type.

Table 13-21 Expenses Paid for Course
Work by Title

ROWS - TITLE	COLUMNS - INSTITUTION PAY FOR JOB-RELATED COURSE: PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIRFC-	559	841	1400
TOP	39.929	60.071	100.000
	74.434	73.067	73.607
ASSOC./	66	101	167
ASSIS.	39.521	60.479	100.000
DIRECT.	8.788	8.775	8.780
FIN.AID	76	112	188
OFFICER	40.426	59.574	100.000
COON/AD	10.120	9.731	9.884
OTHER	50	97	147
	34.014	65.986	100.000
	6.658	8.427	7.729
COLUMN	751	1151	1902
SUMS	39.485	60.515	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-22 Expenses Paid for Course Work by
Kinds of Students Served (Directors)

KINDS OF STUDENTS
ROWS = SERVED

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = JOB-RELATED COURSE:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
GR/PROF	41	54	95
ONLY	41.158	56.842	100.000
	7.401	6.429	6.815
UNDERGR	305	477	782
STUD.	39.003	60.997	100.000
ONLY	55.054	56.786	56.098
UNDGRS	208	309	517
GR/PROF	40.212	59.768	100.000
	37.545	36.786	37.088
COLUMN	554	840	1394
SUMS	19.742	60.258	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-23 Expenses Paid for Course Work by Central
Financial Aid (Directors)

ROWS = CENTRAL FINANCIAL
AID OFFICE?

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = JOB-RELATED COURSE:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
YES	524	808	1332
	19.119	60.661	100.000
	94.245	96.105	95.484
NO	12	11	63
	50.794	49.206	100.000
	5.755	1.695	4.516
COL	556	839	1395
SUMS	19.857	60.143	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-24 Expenses Paid for Course Work by
Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = JOB-RELATED COURSE:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	182	354	536
	33.955	66.045	100.000
	32.793	42.193	38.451
INDEP.	290	434	724
(PRI-	40.055	59.945	100.000
VATF)	52.252	51.728	51.937
PROPRI-	83	51	134
ETARY	61.940	38.060	100.000
	14.955	6.079	9.613
COLUMN	555	839	1394
SUMS	39.813	60.187	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-25 Expenses Paid for Course Work by
Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = TYPE

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = JOB-RELATED COURSE:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC.	71	60	131
TECH.	54.198	45.802	100.000
	13.246	7.317	9.661
2 YEARS	85	181	266
6 UNDER	31.955	68.045	100.000
NOT V.T.	15.858	22.073	19.617
4 YEAR	148	236	384
	38.542	61.458	100.000
	27.612	28.780	28.319
4 YEAR	174	289	463
AND	37.581	62.419	100.000
BEYOND	32.463	35.244	34.145
NURSING	18	7	25
	72.000	28.000	100.000
	3.358	0.854	1.844
GPAD/	40	47	87
PROFES.	45.977	54.023	100.000
ONLY	7.463	5.732	6.416
COLUMN	536	820	1356
SUMS	39.528	60.472	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

TABLE 13-26 "Does Your Institution Provide Paid Release Time for Course Work Related to Your Job?"

Institutions are more willing to provide paid release time for job-related course work (51.4%) than they are to cover course expenses (39.5%). In general, Directors' responses to the above question tended to vary by institutional type, etc., in the same manner as in Tables 13-21 through 13-25.

Table 13-26 Paid Release Time for Course Work by Title

ROWS - TITLE		INSTITUTION PAY FOR COLUMNS = JOB-RELATED COURSE: RELEASED TIME?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIRECT-	7221	6781	1400	
TOP	51.571	44.429	100.000	
	73.929	73.377	73.607	
ASSOC./I	951	721	167	
ASSIS.	56.986	43.114	100.000	
DIRECT.	9.714	7.792	8.780	
FIN.AID	921	961	188	
OFFICER	48.936	51.064	100.000	
COUN/AD	9.407	10.390	9.884	
OTHER	631	781	147	
	46.939	53.061	100.000	
	7.055	8.442	7.729	
COLUMN	970	924	1902	
SUMS	51.420	48.580	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

TABLES 13-27 and 13-28 "Does Your Institution pay for Office Subscriptions?"

Almost 80 percent of the respondents indicated that their institution would pay for office subscriptions (Table 13-27).

There were some differences among Directors' responses (Table 13-28), with Directors from Nursing Schools and two-year colleges indicating the highest levels of institutional unwillingness to pay for office subscriptions.

Table 13-27 Institution Pay for Office Subscriptions by Title

ROWS = TITLE		COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR OFFICE SUBSCRIPTIONS PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIRECTOR	1163	232	1400	
TOR	41.429	16.571	100.000	
	76.293	60.574	73.607	
ASSOC./	116	51	167	
ASSIS.	60.461	30.539	100.000	
DIRECT.	7.637	13.316	9.789	
FIN.AID	111	57	188	
OFFICER	60.681	30.319	100.000	
COUN/AD	8.624	14.883	9.884	
OTHER	104	43	147	
	70.748	29.252	100.000	
	6.947	11.227	7.729	
COLUMN SUMS	1517	383	1902	
	77.463	20.137	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-28 Institution Pay for Office Subscriptions by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = TYPE		COLUMNS = INSTITUTIONAL INSTITUTION PAY FOR OFFICE SUBSCRIPTIONS PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
VOC.	110	21	131	
TECH.	83.969	16.031	100.000	
	9.683	9.545	9.661	
2 YEARS	203	63	266	
6 UNDER	76.316	23.684	100.000	
NUT V.T.	17.870	20.636	19.617	
4 YEAR	330	54	384	
	85.938	14.063	100.000	
	29.049	24.545	28.319	
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	403	60	463	
	87.041	12.959	100.000	
	35.475	27.273	34.145	
NURSING	19	6	25	
	76.000	24.000	100.000	
	1.673	2.727	1.844	
GRAD/PROFES. ONLY	71	16	87	
	81.609	18.391	100.000	
	6.250	7.273	6.416	
COLUMN SUMS	1136	220	1356	
	83.776	16.224	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

TABLES 13-29 Through 13-40

"Does Your Institution Pay for Individual Memberships in State/Regional/National Associations?"

Respondents reported that their institutions were slightly more willing to pay for individual state association memberships than either individual, regional, or national association memberships. As shown in Tables 13-29, 13-30, and 13-31, institutions were more likely to pay for Directors' individual memberships than for respondents in other job categories (significant at the .01 level).

Directors from proprietary institutions were most likely to report that their institutions would pay for individual memberships in either state, regional, or national associations (Tables 13-32, 13-33, 13-34). At the other extreme, Directors from public institutions reported that their institutions were much less likely to pay for such memberships (significant at the .01 level).

As institutional size increased, there was a strong tendency (significant at the .01 level) for institutions to be less likely to pay for individual memberships for Directors (Tables 13-35, 13-36, 13-37).

There were significant differences (at the .01 level) in institutional willingness to pay for Directors' individual memberships. Directors from graduate/professional institutions reported the least institutional willingness to pay for individual memberships, while respondents from vocational/technical schools were at the other end of the continuum (Tables 13-38, 13-39, 13-40).

Table 13-29 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE		INSTITUTION PAY FOR COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO: PAY EXPENSES?		
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
DIREC-	1094	306	1400	
TOP	78.141	21.857	100.000	
	77.424	62.577	73.607	
ASSOC./	110	57	167	
ASSTS.	65.869	34.132	100.000	
DIRECT.	7.785	11.656	8.780	
FIN. AID	127	61	188	
OFFICER	67.551	32.447	100.000	
COORD/AD	8.989	12.474	9.884	
OTHER	92	65	147	
	55.782	44.218	100.000	
	5.903	11.292	7.729	
COLUMN	1413	489	1902	
SUMS	74.290	25.710	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-30 Pay for Individual Memberships -
Regional Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR
IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIPFC- TOR	1059 75.571 78.603	342 24.429 61.511	1400 100.000 73.607
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	92 55.090 6.835	75 44.910 13.489	167 100.000 8.780
FIN. AID OFFICER COMM/AD	117 62.234 8.692	71 17.766 12.770	188 100.000 7.884
OTHER	79 53.741 5.869	68 46.259 12.230	147 100.000 7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1346 70.768 100.000	556 29.232 100.000	1902 100.000 100.000

Table 13-31 Pay for Individual Memberships -
National Associations by Title

ROWS = TITLE

COLUMNS = INSTITUTION PAY FOR
IND. MEMB. NAT. ASSO
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DIPFC- TOR	1020 72.857 78.764	380 27.143 62.603	1400 100.000 73.607
ASSOC./ ASSIS. DIRECT.	89 53.293 6.873	78 46.707 12.850	167 100.000 8.780
FIN. AID OFFICER COMM/AD	110 58.511 8.494	78 41.489 12.850	188 100.000 7.884
OTHER	76 51.701 5.869	71 48.299 11.697	147 100.000 7.729
COLUMN SUMS	1295 68.086 100.000	607 31.914 100.000	1902 100.000 100.000

Table 13-32 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL			INSTITUTION PAY FOR	
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION			IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO:	
			PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	341	193	536	
	63.993	36.007	100.000	
	31.468	63.487	18.451	
INDEP.	624	100	724	
(PRI-	86.188	13.812	100.000	
VATE)	57.248	32.895	51.937	
PROPRI-	123	11	134	
ETARY	91.791	8.209	100.000	
	11.284	3.618	9.613	
COLUMN	1090	304	1394	
SUMS	78.192	21.808	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-33 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL			INSTITUTION PAY FOR	
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION			IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO	
			PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	337	199	536	
	62.873	37.127	100.000	
	31.973	58.529	18.451	
INDEP.	601	123	724	
(PRI-	83.011	16.989	100.000	
VATE)	57.021	36.176	51.937	
PROPRI-	116	19	134	
ETARY	86.567	13.433	100.000	
	11.006	5.244	9.613	
COLUMN	1054	340	1394	
SUMS	75.610	24.390	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-34 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL			INSTITUTION PAY FOR	
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION			IND. MEMB. NAT. ASS:	
			PAY EXPENSES?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS	
PUBLIC	327	209	536	
	61.007	38.993	100.000	
	32.153	55.438	18.451	
INDEP.	581	143	724	
(PRI-	80.249	19.751	100.000	
VATE)	57.129	37.931	51.937	
PROPRI-	109	25	134	
ETARY	81.383	18.657	100.000	
	10.718	6.631	9.613	
COLUMN	1017	377	1394	
SUMS	72.956	27.044	100.000	
	100.000	100.000	100.000	

Table 13-35 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. ST. ASSO:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	432 85.207 19.706	75 14.793 24.590	507 100.000 36.396
1000-3999	348 80.930 31.985	82 19.070 26.885	430 100.000 30.869
4000-9999	163 72.124 14.982	63 27.876 20.656	226 100.000 16.224
10,000-19,999	103 69.128 9.467	46 30.872 15.082	149 100.000 10.696
20,000+	42 51.852 3.860	39 48.148 12.787	81 100.000 5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1088 78.105 100.000	305 21.895 100.000	1393 100.000 100.000

Table 13-36 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	409 80.671 19.878	98 19.329 28.739	507 100.000 36.396
1000-3999	336 78.140 31.939	94 21.860 27.566	430 100.000 30.869
4000-9999	166 73.451 15.779	60 26.549 17.595	226 100.000 16.224
10,000-19,999	101 67.785 9.601	48 32.215 14.076	149 100.000 10.696
20,000+	40 49.381 3.802	41 50.617 12.023	81 100.000 5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1052 75.520 100.000	341 24.480 100.000	1393 100.000 100.000

Table 13-37 Pay for Individual Memberships - National Associations by Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

INSTITUTION PAY FOR
COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. NAT. ASSO:
PAY EXPENSES?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	405 79.982 19.941	102 20.118 26.913	507 100.000 16.396
1000-3999	313 72.791 30.868	117 27.209 10.871	430 100.000 30.869
4000-9999	169 70.796 15.779	66 29.204 17.414	226 100.000 16.224
10,000-19,999	92 61.745 9.073	57 38.255 15.040	149 100.000 10.696
20,000+	44 54.321 4.339	37 45.679 9.763	81 100.000 5.815
COLUMN SUMS	1014 72.793 100.000	379 27.207 100.000	1393 100.000 100.000

Table 13-38 Pay for Individual Memberships - State Associations
by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = TYPE	INSTITUTIONAL		ROW SUMS
	YES	NO	
VOC.	114	171	131
TECH.	87.023	12.977	100.000
	10.745	5.763	9.661
2 YEARS	201	63	266
6 UNDER	76.316	23.684	100.000
NOT V.T.	19.133	21.356	19.617
4 YEAR	333	51	384
	86.719	13.281	100.000
	31.385	17.288	28.319
4 YEAR	334	129	463
AND	72.138	27.862	100.000
BEYOND	31.480	41.729	34.145
NURSING	21	4	25
	84.000	16.000	100.000
	1.979	1.356	1.844
GRAD/	55	31	87
PROFES.	64.369	35.632	100.000
ONLY	5.278	10.508	6.416
COLUMN	1061	295	1356
SUMS	78.245	21.755	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-39 Pay for Individual Memberships - Regional Associations
by Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = TYPE INSTITUTIONAL
COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. REG. ASSO:
PAY EXPENSES?

ROWS = TYPE	INSTITUTIONAL		ROW SUMS
	YES	NO	
VOC.	111	201	131
TECH.	84.713	15.287	100.000
	10.804	6.079	9.661
2 YEARS	195	71	266
6 UNDER	73.308	26.692	100.000
NOT V.T.	18.987	21.581	19.617
4 YEAR	125	59	384
	84.615	15.385	100.000
	31.646	17.913	28.319
4 YEAR	324	139	463
AND	69.978	30.022	100.000
BEYOND	31.548	42.749	34.145
NURSING	19	6	25
	76.000	24.000	100.000
	1.850	1.824	1.844
GRAD/	53	34	87
PROFES.	60.920	39.080	100.000
ONLY	5.161	10.334	6.416
COLUMN	1027	329	1356
SUMS	75.717	24.283	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 13-40 Pay for Individual Memberships -
National Associations by
Institutional Type (Directors)

ROWS = TYPE INSTITUTIONAL
COLUMNS = IND. MEMB. NAT. ASSO:
PAY EXPENSES?

ROWS = TYPE	INSTITUTIONAL		ROW SUMS
	YES	NO	
VOC.	107	24	131
TECH.	81.679	18.321	100.000
	10.830	6.522	9.661
2 YEARS	179	87	266
6 UNDER	67.293	32.707	100.000
NOT V.T.	18.117	23.641	19.617
4 YEAR	311	73	384
	80.990	19.010	100.000
	31.478	19.837	28.319
4 YEAR	321	142	463
AND	69.330	30.670	100.000
BEYOND	32.490	38.587	34.145
NURSING	18	7	25
	72.000	28.000	100.000
	1.822	1.902	1.844
GRAD/	52	35	87
PROFES.	59.770	40.230	100.000
ONLY	5.263	9.511	6.416
COLUMN	988	368	1356
SUMS	72.861	27.139	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Section G

Research Activities

TABLES 14-1 Through 14-15 Has Your Office Conducted Any Research Projects Relating to Financial Aid Topics Within the Past Two Years?

Just over 30 percent of the Directors of Financial Aid responding to the survey stated that their office had conducted research on topics related to financial aid within the past two years. As seen in Tables 14-1 through 14-5, the existence of office research projects on financial aid topics is related to the following: years of employment, educational level, and institutional size, control, and type (significant at the .01 level). For example, respondents from large institutions were over twice as likely to report the existence of office research projects as were respondents from small schools.

(The following section applies only to those Directors indicating that their office had conducted research projects within the past two years)

Approximately 44 percent of the Directors whose offices had conducted research projects stated that some/all of the projects were analytical (i.e., they employed tests of statistical significance). Although there were differences in responses to this question by years of employment, educational level, and institutional size, type, and control, none of the differences were significant at the .05 level (Tables 14-6 through 14-8).

Respondents were requested to state whether their research project(s) dealt with "student attitudes toward either financing postsecondary education or financial aid programs" or with the "impact of financial aid, e.g. on student or institutional decision making." There were no significant differences (at the .05 level) in whether or not research projects dealt with student attitudes based on years of employment, educational level, or institutional type, control, and size. Table 14-9 displays the results of the above question based on institutional size.

The impact of financial aid programs was addressed in over one-half of the research projects which were conducted. There were no significant differences in whether the research related to the impact of financial aid programs based on years of employment (Table 14-10), educational level, or institutional size and type. However, institutional control was related to the above question, with private institutions being most likely (significant at the .01 level) to address the issue of the impact of financial aid programs (Table 14-11).

Respondents were asked to check any or all of three alternatives regarding how the results of their research projects were utilized:

- (1) For internal financial aid office operations and policy making
- (2) For dissemination within selected offices or segments of the institution
- (3) For publication in a professional journal

Approximately 91 percent of the respondents stated that the results of their research were used for financial aid office operations and policy making. There were no significant differences in responses to this question based on years of employment, educational level, or institutional type, control, and size (Table 14-12).

Just over 60 percent of the respondents stated that the results of their research projects were used for institutional dissemination. As years of experience in the financial aid profession increased, there was a greater tendency to share the results of research projects within the respondents' institutions (Table 14-13).

Results of research projects were used for publication in professional journals by approximately 8 percent of the respondents. Publication in professional journals was most common among those holding either doctoral or associate degrees (Table 14-14). As seen in Table 14-15, publication in professional journals was most common among respondents employed in universities and graduate/professional schools.

Table 14-1 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects by Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID		COLUMNS = RECENT RESEARCH PROJECTS ON FINANCIAL AID?	
	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR	24	148	172
EXPER.	13.953	86.047	100.000
OR LESS	5.839	15.711	12.712
2-3	63	170	233
YEARS	27.039	72.961	100.000
EXPER.	15.328	18.047	17.221
4-5	78	194	272
YEARS	28.676	71.324	100.000
EXPER.	18.978	20.594	20.103
6-10	157	281	438
YEARS	35.845	64.155	100.000
	38.200	29.810	32.373
11-15	70	117	187
YEARS	37.433	62.567	100.000
	17.032	12.420	13.821
16+	19	32	51
YEARS	37.255	62.745	100.000
	4.623	3.397	3.769
COLUMN	11	942	1353
SUMS	30.577	69.623	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-2 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects
by Educational Level (Directors)

EDUCATION:
ROWS = HIGHEST LEVEL
ACHIEVED

RECENT RESEARCH
COLUMNS = PROJECTS ON
FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	36	40	76
	47.368	52.632	100.000
	8.802	4.264	5.642
MASTERS	253	452	705
	35.887	64.113	100.000
	61.858	48.188	52.339
BACHELORS	85	282	367
	23.161	76.839	100.000
	20.782	30.064	27.246
ASSOCIATE	9	46	55
	16.364	83.636	100.000
	2.200	4.904	4.083
OTHER	26	118	144
	18.055	81.944	100.000
	6.357	12.580	10.690
COLUMN SUMS	409	938	1347
	30.364	69.636	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-3 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects
by Institutional Size (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = SIZE

RECENT RESEARCH
COLUMNS = PROJECTS ON
FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	89	398	487
	18.275	81.725	100.000
	21.760	42.251	36.047
1000-3999	132	288	420
	31.429	68.571	100.000
	32.274	30.573	31.088
4000-9999	91	132	223
	40.807	59.193	100.000
	22.249	14.013	16.506
10,000-19,999	59	86	145
	40.690	59.310	100.000
	14.425	9.130	10.733
20,000+	38	38	76
	50.000	50.000	100.000
	9.291	4.034	5.625
COLUMN SUMS	409	942	1351
	30.274	69.726	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-4 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects
by Institutional Control (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = CLASSIFICATION:

RECENT RESEARCH
COLUMNS = PROJECTS ON
FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	186	336	522
	35.632	64.368	100.000
	45.366	35.745	38.667
INDEP.	206	496	702
(PRI-	29.345	70.655	100.000
YATE)	50.244	52.766	52.000
PROPRI-	18	108	126
ETARY	14.286	85.714	100.000
	4.390	11.489	9.333
COLUMN	410	940	1350
SUMS	30.370	69.630	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-5 Recent Financial Aid Research Projects
by Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = TYPE:

RECENT RESEARCH
COLUMNS = PROJECTS ON
FINANCIAL AID?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC.	23	101	124
TECH.	18.548	81.452	100.000
	5.764	11.050	9.444
<2YEARS	2	14	16
NOT VOC	12.500	87.500	100.000
TECH.	0.501	1.532	1.219
2 YEAR	62	181	243
NOT VOC	25.514	74.486	100.000
TECH	15.539	19.803	18.507
4 YEAR	115	259	374
	30.749	69.251	100.000
	28.822	28.337	28.484
4 YEAR	175	274	449
AND	38.976	61.024	100.000
BEYOND	43.860	29.978	34.196
NURSING	1	23	24
	4.167	95.833	100.000
	0.251	2.516	1.828
GRAD/	21	62	83
PROFES.	25.301	74.699	100.000
ONLY	5.263	6.783	6.321
COLUMN	399	914	1313
SUMS	30.388	69.612	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-6 Analytical Research Projects by Educational Level (Directors)

EDUCATION:
ROWS = HIGHEST LEVEL ACHIEVED COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTORATE	22	14	36
	61.111	38.889	100.000
	12.360	6.393	9.063
MASTERS	103	142	245
	42.041	57.959	100.000
	57.865	64.840	61.713
BACHELORS	35	47	82
	42.683	57.317	100.000
	19.663	21.461	20.655
ASSOCIATE	5	4	9
	55.556	44.444	100.000
	2.809	1.826	2.267
OTHER	13	12	25
	52.000	48.000	100.000
	7.303	5.479	6.297
COLUMN SUMS	178	219	397
	44.836	55.164	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-7 Analytical Research Projects by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	38	46	84
	45.238	54.762	100.000
	21.348	21.005	21.159
1000-3999	48	78	126
	38.095	61.905	100.000
	26.966	35.616	31.738
4000-9999	44	46	90
	48.889	51.111	100.000
	24.719	21.005	22.670
10,000-19,999	29	31	59
	47.458	52.542	100.000
	15.730	14.155	14.861
20,000+	20	18	38
	52.632	47.368	100.000
	11.236	8.219	9.572
COLUMN SUMS	178	219	397
	44.836	55.164	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-8 Analytical Research Projects by Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE:
ROWS = TYPE: COLUMNS = ANALYTICAL RESEARCH PROJECTS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC.	10	12	22
TECH.	45.455	54.545	100.000
	5.848	5.530	5.670
<2 YEARS	1	1	2
NOT VOC	50.000	50.000	100.000
TECH.	0.585	0.461	0.515
2 YEAR	27	34	61
NOT VOC	44.262	55.738	100.000
TECH	15.789	15.668	15.722
4 YEAR	47	63	110
	42.727	57.273	100.000
	27.485	29.032	28.351
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	80	91	171
	46.784	53.216	100.000
	46.784	41.935	44.072
NURSING	1		1
	100.000		100.000
	0.585		0.258
GRAD/PROFES.	5	16	21
ONLY	23.810	76.190	100.000
	2.924	7.373	5.412
COLUMN SUMS	171	217	388
	44.072	55.928	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-9 Research Projects on Student Attitudes
by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE
COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON STUD. ATTITUDES

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	27 31.395 19.286	59 68.605 22.868	86 100.000 21.608
1000-3999	46 36.220 32.857	81 63.780 31.395	127 100.000 31.910
4000-9999	32 35.556 22.857	58 64.444 22.481	90 100.000 22.613
10,000-19,999	21 36.207 15.000	37 63.793 14.341	58 100.000 14.573
20,000+	14 37.838 10.000	23 62.162 8.915	37 100.000 9.296
COLUMN SUMS	140 35.176 100.000	258 64.824 100.000	398 100.000 100.000

Table 14-10 Research Projects on Student Attitudes by Years Worked (Directors)

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID
COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON IMPACT OF FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR OR LESS	13 56.522 6.311	10 43.478 5.128	23 100.000 5.736
2-3 YEARS	32 51.613 15.534	30 48.387 15.385	62 100.000 15.461
4-5 YEARS	38 49.351 18.447	39 50.649 20.000	77 100.000 19.202
6-10 YEARS	83 54.605 40.291	69 45.395 35.385	152 100.000 37.905
11-15 YEARS	29 42.647 14.078	39 57.353 20.000	68 100.000 16.958
16+ YEARS	11 57.895 5.340	8 42.105 4.103	19 100.000 4.738
COLUMN SUMS	206 51.372 100.000	195 48.628 100.000	401 100.000 100.000

Table 14-11 Research Projects on the Impact of Student Financial Aid Programs (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
COLUMNS = RESEARCH PROJECTS ON IMPACT OF FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS?

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
PUBLIC	78 42.857 38.049	104 57.143 53.333	182 100.000 45.500
INDEP. (PRIVATE)	119 59.204 58.049	82 40.796 42.051	201 100.000 50.250
PROPRIETARY	8 47.059 3.902	9 52.941 4.615	17 100.000 4.250
COLUMN SUMS	205 51.250 100.000	195 48.750 100.000	400 100.000 100.000

Table 14-12 Research Results Used for Internal Office Operations and Policy Making by Institutional Size (Directors)

ROWS = INSTITUTIONAL SIZE COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR INTERNAL OPERATIONS & POLICY MAKING

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
UNDER 1000	81	8	89
	91.011	8.989	100.000
	21.600	23.529	21.760
1000-3999	121	11	132
	91.667	8.333	100.000
	32.267	32.353	32.274
4000-9999	85	6	91
	93.407	6.593	100.000
	22.667	17.647	22.249
10,000-19,999	53	6	59
	89.831	10.169	100.000
	14.133	17.647	14.425
20,000+	35	3	38
	92.105	7.895	100.000
	9.333	8.824	9.291
COLUMN SUMS	375	34	409
	91.687	8.313	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-13 Research Results Used for Institutional Dissemination by Years of Employment (Directors)

ROWS = NO. YEARS WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID COLUMNS = RESULTS USED FOR INSTITUTIONAL DISSEMINATION

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
1 YEAR EXPER. OR LESS	11	13	24
	45.833	54.167	100.000
	4.435	7.975	5.839
2-3 YEARS EXPER.	33	30	63
	52.381	47.619	100.000
	13.306	18.405	15.328
4-5 YEARS EXPER.	45	33	78
	57.692	42.308	100.000
	18.145	20.245	18.978
6-10 YEARS	103	54	157
	65.605	34.395	100.000
	41.532	33.129	38.200
11-15 YEARS	41	29	70
	58.571	41.429	100.000
	16.532	17.791	17.032
16+ YEARS	15	4	19
	78.947	21.053	100.000
	6.048	2.454	4.623
COLUMN SUMS	248	163	411
	60.341	39.659	100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000

Table 14-14 Research Results Used for Publication
in a Professional Journal by
Educational Level (Directors)

EDUCATION:
ROWS = HIGHEST LEVEL
ACHIEVED

RESULTS USED FOR
PUBLICATION IN A
PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL
COLUMNS =

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
DOCTOR- RATE	7 19.444 21.875	29 80.556 7.692	36 100.000 8.802
MASTERS	20 7.905 62.500	233 92.095 61.804	253 100.000 61.858
BACHE- LORS	3 3.529 9.375	82 96.471 21.751	85 100.000 20.782
ASSO- CIATE	1 11.111 3.125	8 88.889 2.122	9 100.000 2.200
OTHER	1 3.846 3.125	25 96.154 6.631	26 100.000 6.357
COLUMN SUMS	32 7.824 100.000	377 92.176 100.000	409 100.000 100.000

Table 14-15 Research Results Used for Publication
in a Professional Journal by
Institutional Type (Directors)

INSTITUTIONAL
ROWS = TYPE:

RESULTS USED FOR
PUBLICATION IN A
PROFESSIONAL JOURNAL
COLUMNS =

	YES	NO	ROW SUMS
VOC. TECH.	23 100.000 6.267	2 100.000 0.501	23 100.000 5.764
<2 YEARS NOT VOC TECH.	2 100.000 0.545	2 100.000 0.501	2 100.000 0.501
2 YEAR NOT VOC TECH	3 4.839 9.375	59 95.161 16.076	62 100.000 15.539
4 YEAR	7 6.087 21.875	108 93.913 29.428	115 100.000 28.822
4 YEAR AND BEYOND	20 11.429 62.500	155 88.571 42.234	175 100.000 43.860
NURSING	1 100.000 0.272	1 100.000 0.251	1 100.000 0.251
GRAD/ PROFES. ONLY	2 9.524 6.250	19 90.476 5.177	21 100.000 5.263
COLUMN SUMS	32 8.020 100.000	367 91.980 100.000	399 100.000 100.000

Appendix A

Financial Aid Directors' Salaries
by Institutional Type, Control, and Size
and by Geographic Area

PUBLIC
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR+
TYPE AND SIZE <7000

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA				3 15.789 30.000	5 26.316 22.727	3 15.789 18.750	1 5.263 11.111	4 21.053 25.000		3 15.789 60.000	19 100.000 22.619
SASFAA				5 29.412 50.000	5 29.412 22.727	4 23.529 25.000	1 5.882 11.111	1 5.882 6.250		1 5.882 20.000	17 100.000 20.238
HASFAA				1 7.143 10.000	2 14.286 9.091	5 35.714 31.250	1 7.143 11.111	5 35.714 31.250			14 100.000 16.667
SWASFAA		1 6.250 100.000	2 12.500 66.667		5 31.250 22.727	1 6.250 6.250	3 18.750 33.333	3 18.750 18.750		1 6.250 20.000	16 100.000 19.048
BHASFAA				1 8.333 10.000	5 41.667 22.727	3 25.000 18.750	2 16.667 22.222	1 8.333 6.250			12 100.000 14.286
WASFAA			1 16.667 33.333				1 16.667 11.111	2 33.333 12.500	2 33.333 100.000		6 100.000 7.143
COLUMN SUMS		1 1.190 100.000	3 3.571 100.000	10 11.905 100.000	22 26.190 100.000	16 19.048 100.000	9 10.714 100.000	16 19.048 100.000	2 2.381 100.000	5 5.752 100.000	84 100.000 100.000

PUBLIC
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR+
TYPE AND SIZE 7-19999

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA					2 15.385 33.333	1 7.692 5.000	3 23.077 15.789	6 46.154 17.647	1 7.692 9.091		13 100.000 13.542
SASFAA			1 4.545 100.000	1 4.545 100.000	2 9.091 33.333	7 31.818 35.000	2 9.091 10.526	7 31.818 20.588	2 9.091 18.182		22 100.000 22.917
HASFAA					1 4.545 16.667	4 18.182 20.000	3 13.636 15.789	10 45.455 29.412	3 13.636 27.273	1 4.545 25.000	22 100.000 22.917
SWASFAA					1 7.692 16.667	5 38.462 25.000	3 23.077 15.789	4 30.769 11.765			13 100.000 13.542
BHASFAA						3 37.500 15.000	3 37.500 15.789	1 12.500 2.941	1 12.500 9.091		8 100.000 8.333
WASFAA							5 27.778 26.316	6 33.333 17.647	4 22.222 36.364	3 16.667 75.000	18 100.000 18.750
COLUMN SUMS		1 1.042 100.000	1 1.042 100.000	1 1.042 100.000	6 6.250 100.000	20 20.833 100.000	19 19.792 100.000	34 35.417 100.000	11 11.458 100.000	4 4.167 100.000	96 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC
 TYPE AND SIZE 4 YEAR+
 20,000+

ROWS = REGIONAL
 ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+ 27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA							1 14.286 14.286	1 14.286 11.111	3 42.857 23.077	2 28.571 12.500	7 100.000 13.208
SASFAA					1 33.333 50.000	2 66.667 33.333					3 100.000 5.660
MASFAA					1 4.545 50.000	3 13.636 50.000	3 13.636 42.857	5 22.727 55.556	4 18.182 30.769	6 27.273 37.500	22 100.000 41.509
SWASFAA							2 40.000 28.571		1 20.000 7.692	2 40.000 12.500	5 100.000 9.434
RNASFAA						1 33.333 16.667		1 33.333 11.111	1 33.333 7.692		3 100.000 5.660
WASFAA							1 7.692 14.286	2 15.385 22.222	4 30.769 30.769	6 46.154 37.500	13 100.000 24.528
COLUMN SUMS					2 3.774 100.000	6 11.321 100.000	7 13.208 100.000	9 16.981 100.000	13 24.528 100.000	16 30.189 100.000	53 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC
 TYPE AND SIZE <4000

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
 OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		1 11.111 50.000		3 33.333 37.500	3 33.333 25.000	1 11.111 20.000	1 11.111 33.333				9 100.000 29.032
SASFAA				3 75.000 37.500	1 25.000 8.333						4 100.000 12.903
HASFAA					3 50.000 25.000	2 33.333 40.000		1 16.667 100.000			6 100.000 19.355
SWASFAA				1 33.333 12.500	2 66.667 16.667						3 100.000 9.677
RHASFAA		1 25.000 50.000			1 25.000 8.333	1 25.000 20.000	1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 12.903
WASFAA				1 20.000 12.500	2 40.000 16.667	1 20.000 20.000	1 20.000 33.333				5 100.000 16.129
COLUMN SUMS		2 6.452 100.000		8 25.806 100.000	12 38.710 100.000	5 16.129 100.000	3 9.677 100.000	1 3.226 100.000			31 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC
 TYPE AND SIZE 4,000+

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
 OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA			1 20.000 100.000	2 40.000 33.333		2 40.000 40.000					5 100.000 20.833
SASFAA				1 25.000 16.667		1 25.000 20.000	1 25.000 25.000	1 25.000 25.000			4 100.000 16.667
HASFAA				3 37.500 50.000			2 25.000 40.000	1 12.500 25.000	2 25.000 100.000		8 100.000 33.333
SWASFAA						1 50.000 20.000	1 50.000 20.000				2 100.000 8.333
RHASFAA						1 33.333 20.000	1 33.333 20.000	1 33.333 25.000			3 100.000 12.500
WASFAA								1 50.000 25.000	1 50.000 100.000		2 100.000 8.333
COLUMN SUMS			1 4.167 100.000	6 25.000 100.000		5 20.833 100.000	5 20.833 100.000	4 16.667 100.000	2 8.333 100.000	1 4.167 100.000	24 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC
TYPE AND SIZE 2 YEAR
<4000

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		2 11.111 33.333	1 5.556 20.000	4 22.222 28.571	4 22.222 23.529	4 22.222 44.444	3 16.667 37.500				18 100.000 26.866
SASFAA	2 15.385 50.000	3 23.077 50.000	2 15.385 40.000	2 15.385 14.286	3 23.077 17.647	1 7.692 11.111					13 100.000 19.403
HASFAA		1 6.667 16.667	1 6.667 20.000	1 6.667 7.143	6 40.000 35.294	2 13.333 22.222	2 13.333 25.000	1 6.667 50.000	1 6.667 100.000		15 100.000 22.388
SWASFAA	2 18.182 50.000			4 36.364 28.571	1 9.091 5.882	2 18.182 22.222	2 18.182 25.000				11 100.000 16.418
RHASFAA			1 14.286 20.000	3 42.857 21.429	2 28.571 11.765		1 14.286 12.500				7 100.000 10.448
WASFAA					1 33.333 5.882			1 33.333 50.000		1 33.333 100.000	3 100.000 4.478
COLUMN SUMS	4 5.970 100.000	6 8.955 100.000	5 7.463 100.000	14 20.896 100.000	17 25.373 100.000	9 13.433 100.000	8 11.940 100.000	2 2.985 100.000	1 1.493 100.000	1 1.493 100.000	67 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLIC
TYPE AND SIZE 2 YEAR
4,000+

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA				2 10.526 40.000	3 15.789 30.000	2 10.526 28.571	3 15.789 14.286	7 36.842 41.176	1 5.263 11.111	1 5.263 25.000	19 100.000 26.027
SASFAA				1 16.667 20.000			3 50.000 14.286	1 16.667 5.882	1 16.667 11.111		6 100.000 8.219
HASFAA				1 4.545 20.000	3 13.636 30.000	2 9.091 28.571	8 36.364 38.095	3 13.636 17.647	4 18.182 44.444	1 4.545 25.000	22 100.000 30.137
SWASFAA				1 9.091 20.000	4 36.364 40.000	1 9.091 14.286	4 36.364 19.048	1 9.091 5.882			11 100.000 15.068
RHASFAA						1 100.000 14.286					1 100.000 1.370
WASFAA						1 7.143 14.286	3 21.429 14.286	5 35.714 29.412	3 21.429 33.333	2 14.286 50.000	14 100.000 19.178
COLUMN SUMS				5 6.849 100.000	10 13.699 100.000	7 9.589 100.000	21 28.767 100.000	17 23.288 100.000	9 12.329 100.000	4 5.479 100.000	73 100.000 100.000

INDEP
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR+
TYPE AND SIZE <4000

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	1	2	6	9	7	6	6	2			39
	2.564	5.128	15.385	23.077	17.949	15.385	15.385	5.128			100.000
	50.000	33.333	28.571	33.333	31.818	42.857	60.000	40.000			36.111
SASFAA	1		5	4	3	1					14
	7.143		35.714	28.571	21.429	7.143					100.000
	50.000		23.810	14.815	13.636	7.143					12.963
HASFAA		1	3	9	6	2	1		1		23
		4.348	13.043	39.130	26.087	8.696	4.348		4.348		100.000
		16.667	14.286	33.333	27.273	14.286	10.000		10.000		21.296
SWASFAA			3	3	3	1		1			11
			27.273	27.273	27.273	9.091		9.091			100.000
			14.286	11.111	13.636	7.143		20.000			10.185
RHASFAA						1					1
						100.000					100.000
						7.143					0.926
WASFAA		3	4	2	3	3	3	2			20
		15.000	20.000	10.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	10.000			100.000
		50.000	19.048	7.407	13.636	21.429	30.000	40.000			18.519
COLUMN SUMS	2	6	21	27	22	14	10	5	1		108
	1.852	5.556	19.444	25.000	20.370	12.963	9.259	4.630	0.926		100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000

INDEP
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR+
TYPE AND SIZE 4,000+

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		1	1	4	8	4	5	7	7	8	45
		2.222	2.222	8.889	17.778	8.889	11.111	15.556	15.556	17.778	100.000
		100.000	50.000	66.667	61.538	28.571	35.714	63.636	58.333	80.000	54.217
SASFAA					1	1			2		4
					25.000	25.000			50.000		100.000
					7.692	7.143			16.667		4.819
HASFAA			1		3	3	5	2	2	1	17
			5.882		17.647	17.647	29.412	11.765	11.765	5.882	100.000
			50.000		23.077	21.429	35.714	18.182	16.667	10.000	20.482
SWASFAA				1		1	3			1	6
				16.667		16.667	50.000			16.667	100.000
				16.667		7.143	21.429			10.000	7.229
RHASFAA						1					1
						100.000					100.000
						7.143					1.205
WASFAA				1	1	4	1	2	1		10
				10.000	10.000	40.000	10.000	20.000	10.000		100.000
				16.667	7.692	28.571	7.143	18.182	8.333		12.048
COLUMN SUMS	1	2	6	13	14	14	11	12	10		83
	1.205	2.410	7.229	15.663	16.867	16.867	13.253	14.458	12.048		100.000
	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000	100.000		100.000

INDEP
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE <1000

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPA	2 9.091 15.385	7 31.818 17.073	7 31.818 28.000	5 22.727 19.231	1 4.545 7.692						22 100.000 17.054
SASPA	2 6.250 15.385	11 34.375 26.829	5 15.625 20.000	8 25.000 30.769	3 9.375 23.077	2 6.250 28.571	1 3.125 50.000				32 100.000 24.806
HASPA	8 15.385 61.538	15 28.846 36.585	9 17.308 36.000	11 21.154 42.308	4 7.692 30.769	4 7.692 57.143		1 1.923 50.000			52 100.000 40.310
SWASPA		3 37.500 7.317	1 12.500 4.000	1 12.500 3.846	2 25.000 15.385		1 12.500 50.000				8 100.000 6.202
RHASPA	1 11.111 7.692	3 33.333 7.317	1 11.111 4.000	1 11.111 3.846	2 22.222 15.385			1 11.111 50.000			9 100.000 6.977
WASPA		2 33.333 4.878	2 33.333 8.000		1 16.667 7.692	1 16.667 14.286					6 100.000 4.651
COLUMN SUMS	13 10.078 100.000	41 31.783 100.000	25 19.380 100.000	26 20.155 100.000	13 10.078 100.000	7 5.426 100.000	2 1.550 100.000	2 1.550 100.000			129 100.000 100.000

INDEP
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR
TYPE AND SIZE 1-1,999

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES
COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASPA		2 5.128 18.182	7 17.949 23.333	12 30.769 42.857	6 15.385 37.500	6 15.385 42.857	3 7.692 33.333	3 7.692 75.000			39 100.000 33.913
SASPA	1 6.250 33.333	2 12.500 18.182	6 37.500 20.000	3 18.750 10.714	2 12.500 12.500	1 6.250 7.143	1 6.250 11.111				16 100.000 13.913
HASPA	1 2.439 33.333	3 7.317 27.273	12 29.268 40.000	12 29.268 42.857	4 9.756 25.000	5 12.195 35.714	3 7.317 33.333	1 2.439 25.000			41 100.000 35.652
SWASPA	1 9.091 33.333	2 18.182 18.182	4 36.364 13.333		2 18.182 12.500	2 18.182 14.286					11 100.000 9.565
RHASPA		1 25.000 9.091	1 25.000 3.333		1 25.000 6.250		1 25.000 11.111				4 100.000 3.478
WASPA		1 25.000 9.091		1 25.000 3.571	1 25.000 6.250		1 25.000 11.111				4 100.000 3.478
COLUMN SUMS	3 2.609 100.000	11 9.565 100.000	30 26.087 100.000	28 24.348 100.000	16 13.913 100.000	14 12.174 100.000	9 7.826 100.000	4 3.478 100.000			115 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = 4 YEAR
 TYPE AND SIZE 2,000+ INDEP

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY: CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		1 5.000 50.000	1 5.000 100.000	2 10.000 28.571	6 30.000 66.667	2 10.000 50.000	6 30.000 60.000	2 10.000 50.000			20 100.000 54.054
SASFAA		1 50.000 50.000			1 50.000 11.111						2 100.000 5.405
MASFAA				3 25.000 42.857	2 16.667 22.222	2 16.667 50.000	3 25.000 30.000	2 16.667 50.000			12 100.000 32.432
SWASFAA											
RMASFAA				1 100.000 14.286							1 100.000 2.703
WASFAA				1 50.000 14.286			1 50.000 10.000				2 100.000 5.405
COLUMN SUMS		2 5.405 100.000	1 2.703 100.000	7 18.919 100.000	9 24.324 100.000	4 10.811 100.000	10 27.027 100.000	4 10.811 100.000			37 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = INDEP
TYPE AND SIZE 2 YEAR

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA	1 7.143 10.000	2 14.286 28.571	3 21.429 42.857	3 21.429 50.000	2 14.286 40.000	1 7.143 100.000	1 7.143 50.000	1 7.143 25.000			14 100.000 33.333
SASFAA	6 46.154 60.000	2 15.385 28.571	2 15.385 28.571	2 15.385 33.333				1 7.692 25.000			13 100.000 30.952
MASFAA	3 37.500 30.000		1 12.500 14.286	1 12.500 16.667	2 25.000 40.000			1 12.500 25.000			8 100.000 19.048
SWASFAA		2 66.667 28.571					1 33.333 50.000				3 100.000 7.143
RHASFAA					1 100.000 20.000						1 100.000 2.381
WASFAA		1 33.333 14.286	1 33.333 14.286					1 33.333 25.000			3 100.000 7.143
COLUMN SUMS	10 23.810 100.000	7 16.667 100.000	7 16.667 100.000	6 14.286 100.000	5 11.905 100.000	1 2.381 100.000	2 4.762 100.000	4 9.524 100.000			42 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = GRAD/
 TYPE AND SIZE PROF

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA				3 100.000 100.000							3 100.000 42.857
SASFAA					1 100.000 33.333						1 100.000 14.286
HASFAA					1 100.000 33.333						1 100.000 14.286
SWASFAA					1 50.000 33.333	1 50.000 100.000					2 100.000 28.571
RHASFAA											
WASFAA											
COLUMN SUMS				3 42.857 100.000	3 42.857 100.000	1 14.286 100.000					7 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = GRAD/
 TYPE AND SIZE PROF

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA		1 5.556 50.000	2 11.111 25.000	6 33.333 100.000	3 16.667 75.000	1 5.556 33.333	2 11.111 66.667	2 11.111 100.000	1 5.556 100.000		18 100.000 62.069
SASFAA			2 100.000 25.000								2 100.000 6.897
HASFAA		1 25.000 50.000	2 50.000 25.000			1 25.000 33.333					4 100.000 13.793
SWASFAA						1 100.000 33.333					1 100.000 3.448
RHASFAA											
WASFAA			2 50.000 25.000		1 25.000 25.000		1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 13.793
COLUMN SUMS		2 6.897 100.000	8 27.586 100.000	6 20.690 100.000	4 13.793 100.000	3 10.345 100.000	3 10.345 100.000	2 6.897 100.000	1 3.448 100.000		29 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLICS
 TYPE AND SIZE INDEP NURSING

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA				1 25.000 33.333	1 25.000 100.000	1 25.000 100.000		1 25.000 100.000			4 100.000 36.364
SASFAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
MASFAA				2 50.000 66.667			1 25.000 100.000		1 25.000 100.000		4 100.000 36.364
SWASFAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
RNASFAA		1 100.000 33.333									1 100.000 9.091
WASFAA											
COLUMN SUMS		3 27.273 100.000		3 27.273 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000	1 9.091 100.000		11 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PUBLICS
 TYPE AND SIZE INDEP VOC.TEC

REGIONAL
 ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS OF STATES
 COLUMNS = SALARY:
 CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000 12,999	\$13,000 14,999	\$15,000 16,999	\$17,000 18,999	\$19,000 20,999	\$21,000 23,999	\$24,000 26,999	\$27000+	ROW SUMS
EASFAA			2 66.667 33.333	1 33.333 50.000							3 100.000 8.571
SASFAA	1 16.667 50.000		1 16.667 16.667	1 16.667 50.000	3 50.000 50.000						6 100.000 17.143
MASFAA	1 6.250 50.000	2 12.500 100.000	1 6.250 16.667		2 12.500 33.333	5 31.250 55.556	2 12.500 66.667	1 6.250 50.000	2 12.500 66.667		16 100.000 45.714
SWASFAA			1 25.000 16.667			2 50.000 22.222	1 25.000 33.333				4 100.000 11.429
RNASFAA					1 33.333 16.667	1 33.333 11.111		1 33.333 50.000			3 100.000 8.571
WASFAA			1 33.333 16.667			1 33.333 11.111			1 33.333 33.333		3 100.000 8.571
COLUMN SUMS	2 5.714 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	6 17.143 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	6 17.143 100.000	9 25.714 100.000	3 8.571 100.000	2 5.714 100.000	3 8.571 100.000		35 100.000 100.000

ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = PROPRI.
TYPE AND SIZE VOC.TEC

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
EASPA	1 8.333 20.000	3 25.000 27.273	1 8.333 8.333	3 25.000 27.273		2 16.667 50.000			1 8.333 33.333	1 8.333 20.000	12 100.000 21.818
SASPA			1 20.000 8.333	3 60.000 27.273		1 20.000 25.000					5 100.000 9.091
HASPA		1 9.091 9.091	7 63.636 58.333	1 9.091 9.091	1 9.091 33.333				1 9.091 33.333		11 100.000 20.000
SWASPA	1 16.667 20.000	2 33.333 18.182	3 50.000 25.000								6 100.000 10.909
RHASPA	2 40.000 40.000			1 20.000 9.091	1 20.000 33.333				1 20.000 33.333		5 100.000 9.091
WASPA	1 6.250 20.000	5 31.250 45.455		3 18.750 27.273	1 6.250 33.333	1 6.250 25.000	1 6.250 100.000			4 25.000 80.000	16 100.000 29.091
COLUMN SUMS	5 9.091 100.000	11 20.000 100.000	12 21.818 100.000	11 20.000 100.000	3 5.455 100.000	4 7.273 100.000	1 1.818 100.000		3 5.455 100.000	5 9.091 100.000	55 100.000 100.000

ALL
ITS: INSTITUTIONAL = OTHER
TYPE AND SIZE PROPRI.

REGIONAL
ROWS = ASSOCIATIONS
OF STATES

COLUMNS = SALARY:
CURRENT ANNUAL

	UNDER \$9,000	\$9,000- 10,999	\$11,000- 12,999	\$13,000- 14,999	\$15,000- 16,999	\$17,000- 18,999	\$19,000- 20,999	\$21,000- 23,999	\$24,000- 26,999	\$27,000+	ROW SUMS
EASPA	1 12.500 20.000	1 12.500 12.500		1 12.500 50.000	3 37.500 42.857	1 12.500 100.000		1 12.500 50.000			8 100.000 24.242
SASPA	2 22.222 40.000	1 11.111 12.500	4 44.444 50.000	1 11.111 50.000				1 11.111 50.000			9 100.000 27.273
HASPA	1 10.000 20.000	4 40.000 50.000	2 20.000 25.000		3 30.000 42.857						10 100.000 30.303
SWASPA	1 33.333 20.000	2 66.667 25.000									3 100.000 9.091
RHASPA											
WASPA			2 66.667 25.000		1 33.333 14.286						3 100.000 9.091
COLUMN SUMS	5 15.152 100.000	8 24.242 100.000	8 24.242 100.000	2 6.061 100.000	7 21.212 100.000	1 3.030 100.000		2 6.061 100.000			33 100.000 100.000

Appendix B

1974 Survey Questionnaire



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

CENTRAL OFFICE AND PLACEMENT SERVICE
910 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 228
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 785-0453

March 11, 1974

Dear Director of Financial Aid:

I know that you are vitally concerned about the role of the financial aid administrator in post-secondary education today and in the future. The National Council of NASFAA shares this concern and therefore has commissioned William J. Bushaw of the University of Iowa to conduct the enclosed survey to determine the function, training, status and other relevant information about our rapidly expanding profession. It is hoped that the data obtained can be used to upgrade the aid administrator through better training, more adequate staffing, greater stature within the institution, and improved compensation.

The questionnaire consists of two sections. Section One applies to all financial aid administrators at your institution. Because of the cost factor, I would deeply appreciate your making sufficient copies to allow each member of your professional staff to complete the first portion of this survey.

Section Two pertains to the financial aid office and requires completion only by the director. All individual responses will be held strictly confidential.

The National Council urges you to take the relatively brief time needed to complete this important survey and return it to Mr. Bushaw at the address below within two weeks. Thanks so much for your cooperation in this vital survey.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Eunice L. Edwards
President

Return Surveys to:

NASFAA Professional Survey
The University of Iowa
Office of Financial Aids
106 Old Dental Building
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

180

-171-

SECTION ONE: The questions in this section should be answered by all professional financial aid administrators. Please answer each question if at all possible. Give the best answer you can, and if desired, explain any answer in the "comments" section. To economize, we are asking each Director to reproduce enough copies of Section One for distribution to the professional staff.

1. To support professional development of Aid Officers, does your institution provide released time and/or pay expenses for any of the following? (Check all that apply.)

Released Time	Pay Expenses	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Aid Meetings within state
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Aid Meetings out-of-state
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Coursework related to job
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Outside professional activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Attendance at workshops
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office subscriptions
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual membership in state aid association
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Individual membership in regional and national aid association

2. In your judgment, what areas of academic preparation would be especially useful for Aid Officers? Which did you have?

Useful	I Had	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data Processing
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Accounting
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Statistics
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Counseling
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Law
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Government
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office Management
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Internship/Practicum in Financial Aid
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Aid Administration

3. What types of information for job orientation are especially useful for New Aid Officers? Which did you have?

Useful	I Had	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Written Job Description
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Limits of Authority
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Institutional Policies
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Office Administration
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Overview of Yearly Work
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Program Procedures
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Minority/Poverty Issues
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Inter-Office Relationships
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Procedures Manual
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget Preparation

4. Ideally, what is the single best way for new Aid Officers to get practical experience? Check those you had.

Single Best	I Had
<input type="checkbox"/> Internship/Practicum/Assistantship	<input type="checkbox"/> Internship/Practicum/Assistantship
<input type="checkbox"/> Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)	<input type="checkbox"/> Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)
<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop (2-5 Days)	<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop (2-5 Days)
<input type="checkbox"/> On-the-job Training	<input type="checkbox"/> On-the-job Training

5. In what ways would you prefer to keep current? Assume all are available and check only those you would most likely use.

<input type="checkbox"/> Occasional coursework
<input type="checkbox"/> Workshop (2-5 Days)
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional meetings--state-wide
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional meetings--regional
<input type="checkbox"/> Professional meetings--national
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Aid newsletters
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>The Journal of Student Financial Aid</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Summer Institute (2-4 Weeks)
<input type="checkbox"/> Self-study materials
<input type="checkbox"/> Meeting periodically with Regional Office of Education Officials
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify.) _____

6. Check the most useful topics for inclusion in workshops to train new Aid Officers and to keep experienced Aid Officers current.

New	Experienced	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Personnel Management and Office Organization
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Research Methods and Findings
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Data Processing Applications
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Report Preparation (including budget preparation)
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Need Analysis
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Operation of Student Employment Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Status of Student Aid Legislation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Interviewing Techniques
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fund Raising or Developing New Sources of Aid
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Minority/Poverty Issues

7. Which of the following have you done? (Check as many as apply.)

<input type="checkbox"/>	Read financial aid newsletters regularly.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Read <u>The Journal of Student Financial Aid</u> regularly.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Read <u>The Chronical of Higher Education</u> or "Higher Education and National Affairs" regularly.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attended an aid association meeting in the past year.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Done committee work for an aid association in the past three years.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Participated in an aid meeting (read paper, led discussion, appeared on a panel, etc) in the past three years.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Held an office in an aid association in the past three years.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Served as a consultant off campus in the past three years.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Attended professional association meetings other than those of a financial aid association in the past year.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Published or submitted for publication an article in a professional journal in the past three years.

8. Are you a member of a state financial aid association?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ There is not an aid association in my state.

9. Are you a member of a regional aid association?

- ☐ Yes - EASFAA ☐ Yes - SWASFAA
☐ Yes - MASFAA ☐ Yes - WASFAA
☐ Yes - RMASFAA ☐ No
☐ Yes - SASFAA

10. In developing the Financial Aid Profession further, how important do you rate each of the following?

Rate each item according to the following scale:

- 1=Very important
2=Important
3=Not so important

- ☐ Hold seminars on the use of technology in the financial aid office.
☐ Develop a written code of ethics.
☐ Conduct more research.
☐ Encourage the establishment of graduate training programs.
☐ Provide immediate training for newly appointed aid officers.
☐ Provide opportunities for professional growth for those in smaller aid operations.
☐ Develop self-study materials for new aid officers.
☐ Provide training in effective legislative advocacy.
☐ Establish a recommended set of credentials for aid officers.
☐ Other (Please specify.) _____

11. What is your age?

- ☐ 21-24 ☐ 36-40 ☐ 51-55
☐ 25-30 ☐ 41-45 ☐ 56-60
☐ 31-35 ☐ 46-50 ☐ Over 60

12. What is your sex?

- ☐ Male
☐ Female

13. What is your race or ethnic background?

- ☐ Black American ☐ Spanish American
☐ American Indian ☐ American Caucasian
☐ Oriental American

14. What is the highest degree you have earned?

- ☐ High School Diploma or less
☐ Associate Arts or 2-year certificate
☐ Bachelors
☐ Masters
☐ Graduate work which led to a degree between the Masters and Doctorate
☐ Doctorate

15. Are any of your degrees from the institution at which you are currently working?

- ☐ Yes - Undergraduate
☐ Yes - Graduate
☐ Both
☐ No

16. Are you presently enrolled in a degree program?

- ☐ Yes - Associate Arts/2-year certificate
☐ Yes - Bachelors
☐ Yes - Masters
☐ Yes - Mid-Degree (i.e., Ed.S.)
☐ Yes - Doctorate
☐ No

17. Do you plan to pursue a higher degree in the future?

- ☐ Yes - Associate Arts/2-year certificate
☐ Yes - Bachelors
☐ Yes - Masters
☐ Yes - Mid-Degree (i.e., Ed.S.)
☐ Yes - Doctorate
☐ No
☐ Uncertain

18. Which best describes your present position?

- ☐ Full-time Aid Administrator
☐ Part-time Aid Administrator
☐ If part-time, list other responsibilities, if any.

19. How long have you worked in Financial Aid?

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 8-10 years
☐ 1-2 years ☐ 11-15 years
☐ 3-4 years ☐ Over 15 years
☐ 5-7 years

20. What is your current salary?

☐ Under \$5,000 ☐ \$14,000 - 15,999
☐ \$ 5,000 - 7,499 ☐ \$16,000 - 17,999
☐ \$ 7,500 - 9,999 ☐ \$18,000 - 19,999
☐ \$10,000 - 11,999 ☐ \$20,000 - 21,999
☐ \$12,000 - 13,999 ☐ \$22,000 or more

21. What was your position just previous to the present one? Two positions ago?

Most Recent 2nd Most Recent

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Director of Financial Aid at another school
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Aid Officer at another school
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Financial Aid Officer at the same school
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employed in Higher Education in a capacity other than Financial Aid
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employed in Elementary/Secondary Education
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employed in Government Service
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Employed in Private Business
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Military
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Student
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify.) _____

This completes the questions asked of all Aid Officers. Thank you for your cooperation.

Comments:

SECTION TWO: These questions deal with staffing and office operations and are to be answered by the Director of Financial Aid.

22. Your institution is classified as which one of the following?

☐ Public 2 year or less
☐ Public 4 year only
☐ Public 4 year and beyond
☐ Public Graduate/Professional only
☐ Private 2 year or less
☐ Private 4 year only
☐ Private 4 year and beyond
☐ Private Graduate/Professional only
☐ Proprietary

23. What is the full-time enrollment at your institution?

<input type="checkbox"/> 0 - 249	<input type="checkbox"/> 1000 - 2499	<input type="checkbox"/> 10,000 - 14,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 250 - 499	<input type="checkbox"/> 2500 - 4999	<input type="checkbox"/> 15,000 - 19,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 500 - 749	<input type="checkbox"/> 5000 - 7499	<input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 or more
<input type="checkbox"/> 750 - 999	<input type="checkbox"/> 7500 - 9999	

24. Where does the Office of Student Financial Aid report within your institution? (Check one.)

☐ Directly to the President
☐ To Chief Administrator for Student Services (Either a Vice-President, Dean, or Director)
☐ To a second level student personnel officer (Assistant Dean for Student Services, Registrar, Director of Admissions)
☐ To Chief Fiscal Officer (Vice-President for Finance)
☐ To second level fiscal officer (Cashier, Chief Accountant)
☐ Other (Please specify) _____

25. How many people do you officially report through to reach the President of the institution?

☐ None ☐ 3
☐ 1 ☐ 4
☐ 2 ☐ 5 or more

26. How long have you been a Financial Aid Director?

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 8 - 10 years
☐ 1 - 2 years ☐ 11 - 15 years
☐ 3 - 4 years ☐ Over 15 years
☐ 5 - 7 years

27. How much financial aid experience do you consider necessary to hold your present position? How much did you have when assuming it?

<u>Necessary Now</u>		<u>I Had</u>
___	Under 1 year	___
___	1 - 3 years	___
___	4 - 5 years	___
___	Over 5 years	___

28. How many full-time professional staff assistants do you employ? ___

29. How many full-time clerical staff do you employ? ___

30. How many part-time assistants do you employ? (Include both clerical and professional) ___

31. Which of the following operational activities are the responsibility of the financial aid office? (Check all that apply.)

___ Informational activities, i.e., counseling students, visiting secondary schools and community colleges, meeting with community and fraternal organizations.

___ Needs analysis (ascertaining need and seeing that program qualifications are met)

___ Aid packaging (awarding type of aid and notifying awardee)

___ Authorizing the disbursement of funds to awardee (notifying fiscal authority of amount and form of award so a check can be prepared)

___ Disbursing funds to awardee (actually handling payment of funds or establishing credit for awardee)

___ Do fund accounting (maintaining own office records regarding program expenditures rather than receiving monthly statements from the Business Office)

___ Fiscal reporting (preparing summation of activities and expenditures)

___ Loan collections (periodic billing for and bookkeeping of loan repayments)

___ Placement or referral of individuals for Work-Study positions.

___ Placement or referral of individuals for regular part-time employment.

32. Where are each of the following programs administered at your institution?

Use the following code for designating location:

- 1=By the Aid Office
2=By some other office
3=By both the Aid and some other office
4=Aid not available

___ National Direct Student Loan
___ Educational Opportunity Grant
___ College Work-Study Program
___ Health Professions Programs
___ Nursing Program
___ Law Enforcement Education Program
___ Federally Insured or State Guaranteed Loan Program
___ Regular Part-Time Jobs
___ Institutional Loans
___ Academic Scholarships to Entering Freshmen
___ Academic Scholarships to Enrolled Undergraduates
___ Institutional Grants
___ Graduate Scholarships
___ Graduate Assistantships
___ Cuban Loan Program
___ State Scholarships
___ State Grants

33. Number of students who applied for aid through the institution in 1972-73. ___

34. List the number of students assisted and the total amount of funds distributed under each of the following aid categories for program year 1972-73. Include Federal, State, and Institutional shares.

<u>Loans</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>1972-73 Amounts</u>
Institutionally Based (i.e., college-based federal programs, institutional Federally Insured Loans, institutional long and short-term loans)	___	___
Non-Institutionally Based (i.e., Federally Insured or State Guaranteed Student Loans through a private lender, loans through state agencies, and loans from private or fraternal organizations)	___	___
TOTAL LOANS	___	___

34. (Continued)

COMMENTS:

<u>Scholarships</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>1972-73 Amounts</u>
Institutionally Based (i.e., Institutional scholarships or endow- ment funded scholar- ships institutionally administered)	_____	_____
Non-institutionally Based (i.e., State scholarship program, donor selected scholarships)	_____	_____
TOTAL SCHOLARSHIPS	_____	_____
<u>Grants</u>		
Institutionally Based (i.e., college-based federal programs, ath- letic grants-in-aid, institutional grants, activities awards)	_____	_____
Non-institutionally Based (i.e., VA, Social Security, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Bonus Board Benefits, State tuition grants)	_____	_____
TOTAL GRANTS	_____	_____
Employment (i.e., College Work-Study, regular part-time employ- ment, graduate assistantships)	_____	_____
TOTAL ALL AID	_____	_____
TOTAL ALL AID (Unduplicated count)	_____	_____

Thank you for cooperating in this survey. If you have any other comments concerning or ideas regarding professional development, feel free to make them in the comments section. Upon completing the survey, staple the flap and mail. No postage is required.

180

Appendix C

1977 Survey Questionnaire



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS

CENTRAL OFFICE AND PLACEMENT SERVICE

910 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Suite 228

Washington, D.C. 20006

(202) 785-0453

August, 1977

Dear Colleague:

Recently the National Council of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators formed a special committee to gather, study, and report on selected characteristics of financial aid administrators, the programs they administer, and their opinions on current issues in financial aid. The special committee consists of Harvey Grotrian and Robert Holmes of the University of Michigan and Karen Dickinson of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research.

The questionnaire developed by the committee is enclosed. As you can see the questionnaire represents an ambitious effort to learn more about individuals who are employed in the financial aid profession. I urge you to promptly complete the questionnaire and return it using the prepaid addressed envelope which is also enclosed.

The questionnaire is to be completed only by individuals who are employed in financial aid at educational institutions. We are particularly aware of the sensitive nature of some of the information you are asked to provide. Therefore, the study has been designed so that your replies will be treated with the strictest confidence and so that it will not be possible to connect anyone with his or her responses.

It is crucial that any study of this type be based upon a high percentage of those surveyed. Last month the Midwest Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators published a study to which nearly 75 percent of the MASFAA members contributed. Given the ease with which this questionnaire can be completed, I hope that we can do at least as well on a national basis.

Best wishes for continued success in the year ahead. The committee looks forward to receiving your response.

Sincerely,

Joe L. McCormick
President

Directions: Please answer the following questions by putting an "X" in the appropriate parentheses. Typically, this will involve putting an "X" on a number or letter between the parentheses. Do not darken the entire area between the parentheses. If you believe that more than one response is appropriate, please only check the most appropriate response. Only one response is required for each question numbered 1-41, 44-49, and 51.

DO NOT MAKE
ENTRIES IN THIS
AREA-FOR OFFICE
USE ONLY

Personal and Professional Characteristics

I I I I I
[1-4]

1. WHAT IS YOUR TITLE?

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| (1) Director | (4) Financial Aid Officer/
Counselor/Advisor |
| (2) Associate Director | |
| (3) Assistant Director | (5) Other (specify) _____ |

[5]

2. WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| (1) Under 20 | (5) 36-40 |
| (2) 20-25 | (6) 41-45 |
| (3) 26-30 | (7) 46-50 |
| (4) 31-35 | (8) 51-59 |
| | (9) 60 and over |

[6]

3. WHAT IS YOUR SEX?

- | | |
|----------|------------|
| (1) Male | (2) Female |
|----------|------------|

[7]

4. WHAT IS YOUR RACE OR ETHNIC BACKGROUND?

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| (1) Black American | (4) Spanish Surnamed American |
| (2) American Indian | (5) American Caucasian |
| (3) Oriental American | (6) Other (specify) _____ |

[8]

5. ARE YOU A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID ADMINISTRATORS (NASFAA)?

- | | |
|---------|--------|
| (1) Yes | (2) NO |
|---------|--------|

[9]

6. WHICH BEST DESCRIBES YOUR EMPLOYMENT?

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| (1) Full Time | (3) More than half time and less
than full time |
| (2) Full Time-9 month assignment | (4) Half Time |
| | (5) Less than half time |

[10]

7. WHICH BEST DESCRIBES THE AMOUNT OF EMPLOYMENT TIME YOU DEVOTE TO FINANCIAL AID?

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| (1) 100% | (4) 25-49% |
| (2) 75-99% | (5) 1-24% |
| (3) 50-74% | |

[11]

8. IF YOU DEVOTE LESS THAN 100% OF YOUR TIME TO FINANCIAL AID, PLEASE INDICATE YOUR PRIMARY OTHER AREA OF RESPONSIBILITIES: (CHECK ONLY ONE)

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (1) Dean of Students Office | (6) Academic Affairs Office |
| (2) Office of the Registrar | (7) Business Office |
| (3) Office of Career Planning | (8) Teaching |
| (4) Office of Admissions | (9) Other (specify) _____ |
| (5) Counseling Center | |

[12]

9. HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU WORKED IN FINANCIAL AID?

OFFICE USE
ONLY

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------|
| (1) Less than 1 year (limited experience) | (5) 4 years | |
| (2) 1 year's experience | (6) 5 years | |
| (3) 2 years | (7) 6-10 years | |
| (4) 3 years | (8) 11-15 years | [13] |
| | (9) 16 years and over | |

10. WHAT IS THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION YOU HAVE ACHIEVED?

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|------|
| (1) Doctorate | (4) Associate | |
| (2) Masters | (5) Other (specify) _____ | [14] |
| (3) Bachelors | | |

11. WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ANNUAL SALARY?

- | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------|------|
| (A) under \$9,000 | (G) \$19,000-20,999 | |
| (B) \$9,000-10,999 | (H) \$21,000-23,999 | |
| (C) \$11,000-12,999 | (I) \$24,000-26,999 | |
| (D) \$13,000-14,999 | (J) \$27,000-29,999 | |
| (E) \$15,000-16,999 | (K) \$30,000-34,999 | [15] |
| (F) \$17,000-18,999 | (L) \$35,000+ | |

12. TENURE

- (1) I presently have tenure
- (2) I am eligible to receive tenure at a future time
- (3) I am not eligible for tenure

[16]

13. HOW MANY TIMES IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS HAVE YOU WRITTEN OR CALLED ANY OF THE FOLLOWING REGARDING A FINANCIAL AID PROBLEM OR ISSUE?

	A None	B 1-2	C 3-5	D 6-9	E 10+	
1. Office of a U.S. Senator/U.S. Representative	()	()	()	()	()	[17]
2. Federal Official (DHEW/USOE) in Washington	()	()	()	()	()	[18]
3. Federal Official in a USOE Regional Office	()	()	()	()	()	[19]
4. State Senator/State Representative	()	()	()	()	()	[20]
5. State Agency Official	()	()	()	()	()	[21]
6. NASFAA Central Office	()	()	()	()	()	[22]

Institutional Characteristics/Office of Financial Aid Characteristics

14. HOW IS YOUR INSTITUTION CLASSIFIED?

- (1) Public
- (2) Independent (Private)
- (3) Proprietary

[23]

15. WHAT IS THE TYPE OF YOUR INSTITUTION?
- (1) Vocational-technical
 - (2) Less than 2 years (not vocational-technical)
 - (3) 2 year (not vocational-technical)
 - (4) 4 year
 - (5) 4 year and beyond
 - (6) Nursing
 - (7) Graduate/professional only
- [24]
16. WHAT IS THE TOTAL SIZE OF YOUR INSTITUTION? (Total Headcount Enrollment of students on all Campuses and Departments)
- | | |
|---------------|-----------------|
| (A) Under 500 | (G) 10000-14999 |
| (B) 500-999 | (H) 15000-19999 |
| (C) 1000-1999 | (I) 20000-29999 |
| (D) 2000-3999 | (J) 30000-39999 |
| (E) 4000-6999 | (K) 40000-49999 |
| (F) 7000-9999 | (L) 50000+ |
- [25]
17. IN WHAT TYPE OF SETTING DO YOU WORK? (Please read all the possible choices before checking the best response)
- (1) a single campus institution
(If you checked response number 1 to this question, please skip to question 19)
 - (2) an academic area (law, medicine, etc.) or an academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.) of a single campus institution
 - (3) a branch campus
 - (4) an academic area or an academic level of a branch campus
 - (5) a main campus with one or more branch campuses
 - (6) an academic area or an academic level of a main campus with one or more branch campuses
 - (7) one of the administratively equal campuses of a multi-campus institution
 - (8) an academic area or an academic level of one of the administratively equal campuses of a multi-campus institution
 - (9) none of the above
- [26]
18. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF THE SETTING (See Question 17) IN WHICH YOU WORK? Total Headcount Enrollment of your campus, academic department (medicine, law, etc.) or academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.)
- | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (A) Under 200 | (F) 2000-3999 | (K) 20000-29999 |
| (B) 200-299 | (G) 4000-6999 | (L) 30000-39999 |
| (C) 300-499 | (H) 7000-9999 | (M) 40000+ |
| (D) 500-999 | (I) 10000-14999 | |
| (E) 1000-1999 | (J) 15000-19999 | |
- [27]

19. IN WHICH STATE IS YOUR INSTITUTION LOCATED?

OFFICE USE
ONLY

- | | | |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| (01) Ala. | (19) La. | (37) Oakl. |
| (02) Alaska | (20) Maine | (38) Oreg. |
| (03) Ariz. | (21) Md. | (39) Pa. |
| (04) Ark. | (22) Mass. | (40) R.I. |
| (05) Calif. | (23) Mich. | (41) S.C. |
| (06) Colo. | (24) Minn. | (42) S. Dak. |
| (07) Conn. | (25) Miss. | (43) Tenn. |
| (08) Del. | (26) Mo. | (44) Tex. |
| (09) D.C. | (27) Mont. | (45) Utah |
| (10) Fla. | (28) Nebr. | (46) Vt. |
| (11) Ga. | (29) Nev. | (47) Va. |
| (12) Hawaii | (30) N.H. | (48) Wash. |
| (13) Idaho | (31) N.J. | (49) W. Va. |
| (14) Ill. | (32) N. Mex. | (50) Wis. |
| (15) Ind. | (33) N.Y. | (51) Wyo. |
| (16) Iowa | (34) N.C. | (52) P.R. |
| (17) Kans. | (35) N. Dak. | (53) All other |
| (18) Ky. | (36) Ohio | |

[28-29]

20. WHAT IS THE TITLE OF YOUR IMMEDIATE SUPERVISOR?

- (A) President or Chancellor
- (B) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Student Affairs
- (C) Associate/Assistant Chancellor or Vice-President for student affairs
- (D) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs/Treasurer
- (E) Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Business Affairs
- (F) Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- (G) Associate/Assistant Vice-Chancellor or Vice-President for Academic Affairs
- (H) Dean of Students
- (I) Dean of Academic Affairs
- (J) Director of Admissions
- (K) Director of Admissions and Financial Aid/Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid
- (L) Controller/Comptroller
- (M) Manager/Administrator
- (N) Director or Associate/Assistant Director of Financial Aid
- (O) Other (specify) _____

[30]

21. HOW MANY PEOPLE DO YOU OFFICIALLY REPORT THROUGH TO REACH THE PRESIDENT (OR CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER) OF YOUR SCHOOL?

- | | |
|--------------|---------------|
| (1) None | (4) 3 people |
| (2) 1 person | (5) 4 people |
| (3) 2 people | (6) 5 or more |

[31]

22. WHAT KINDS OF STUDENTS DOES YOUR OFFICE SERVE?

- (1) Graduate/Professional Students Only
- (2) Undergraduate Students Only
- (3) Undergraduate and Graduate/Professional Students

[32]

23. IS YOUR OFFICE CONSIDERED THE CENTRAL FINANCIAL AID OFFICE ON YOUR CAMPUS?

- | | |
|---------|--------|
| (1) Yes | (2) No |
|---------|--------|

[33]

(if yes, skip to question 24)

If your office is not the Central Financial Aid Office on your campus, indicate the primary academic unit which you serve: (check only one)

OFFICE USE
ONLY

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| (0) Biological & health sciences
(excluding nursing) | (5) Theology |
| (1) Nursing | (6) Social Sciences |
| (2) Physical sciences & engineering | (7) Language & fine arts |
| (3) Law | (8) All academic areas |
| (4) Business/Management | (9) Other (specify) _____ |

[34]

Attitudes & Opinions

How do you feel about the following statements?

	1 Strongly Agree	2 Moderately Agree	3 Moderately Disagree	4 Strongly Disagree	8 No Opinion or Does Not Apply	
24. I have enough authority to do my job effectively.	()	()	()	()	()	[35]
25. My superiors have a clear picture of the kind of job I am doing in financial aid administration.	()	()	()	()	()	[36]
26. I am recognized by others in my institution as holding an important position.	()	()	()	()	()	[37]
27. In comparison to the salaries in other institutions & to those of individuals not employed in education, my salary is adequate.	()	()	()	()	()	[38]
28. In comparison to the salaries of others in my institution, my salary is adequate.	()	()	()	()	()	[39]
29. Financial aid work as a full-time job is sufficiently satisfying to be a life-time career for me.	()	()	()	()	()	[40]

	1 <u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	2 <u>Moderately</u> <u>Agree</u>	3 <u>Moderately</u> <u>Disagree</u>	4 <u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	8 No Opinion or Does Not Apply	
30. Communications from NASFAA & regional SFA associations are generally adequate to keep me up to date with changes in legislation, regulations, & with current issues in financial aid.	()	()	()	()	()	[41]
31. Institutions should have increased authority for inter-fund transfers between the SEOG, CWS, & NDSL programs.	()	()	()	()	()	[42]
32. My institution would have a greater feeling of responsibility for the BEOG & GSL programs if we received a federal administrative allowance.	()	()	()	()	()	[43]
33. In general, professional training activities which I have engaged in as a participant have been adequate.	()	()	()	()	()	[44]
34. There is a need for periodic program reviews of financial aid offices by U.S. Office of Education staff.	()	()	()	()	()	[45]
35. There should be a formal certification process for financial aid administrators.	()	()	()	()	()	[46]
36. The regional review panel process is an equitable way of making funding decisions.	()	()	()	()	()	[47]
37. My institution has received good support from the Regional U.S. Office of Education.	()	()	()	()	()	[48]

- | | 1
<u>Strongly</u>
<u>Agree</u> | 2
<u>Moderately</u>
<u>Agree</u> | 3
<u>Moderately</u>
<u>Disagree</u> | 4
<u>Strongly</u>
<u>Disagree</u> | 8
No Opinion
or Does
Not Apply | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|------|
| 38. There has been an unacceptable amount of deliberate student abuse of financial aid programs at my institution. | () | () | () | () | () | [49] |
| 39. The Tri-Partite application process should be revised to depend more heavily on verifiable, historical data. | () | () | () | () | () | [50] |
| 40. Even given equal financial need, half-time students are less likely to be assisted than full-time students at my institution. | () | () | () | () | () | [51] |
| 41. IF YOU WERE ABLE TO ATTEND ONLY ONE MAJOR CONFERENCE PER YEAR, WHICH ONE WOULD YOU PREFER: | | | | | | |
| (1) NASFAA National Conference | | | (3) State | | | |
| (2) Your Regional Conference | | | (4) Other (specify) _____ | | | [52] |
| 42. DOES YOUR INSTITUTION PROVIDE PAID RELEASED TIME FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) | | | | | | |
| (1) Attendance at Aid Meeting within state | | | | | | [53] |
| (2) Attendance at Aid Meeting out of state | | | | | | [54] |
| (3) Course work related to the job | | | | | | [55] |
| (4) Attendance at workshops | | | | | | [56] |
| 43. DOES YOUR INSTITUTION PAY YOUR EXPENSES FOR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING? (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY) | | | | | | |
| (1) Attendance at Aid Meeting within state | | | | | | [57] |
| (2) Attendance at Aid Meeting out of state | | | | | | [58] |
| (3) Course work related to the job | | | | | | [59] |
| (4) Attendance at workshops | | | | | | [60] |
| (5) Office subscriptions | | | | | | [61] |
| (6) Individual membership in state association | | | | | | [62] |
| (7) Individual membership in regional association | | | | | | [63] |
| (8) Individual membership in national association | | | | | | [64] |

The remaining questions are to be answered only by (1) the Director of Financial Aid on your campus, (2) the person solely responsible for the administration of aid on your campus, or (3) the person solely responsible for the administration of aid in a specific academic unit (law, medicine, etc.) or in a specific academic level (undergraduate, graduate, etc.). If you do not fall into one of the three categories, the survey is now completely filled out and is ready to be returned in the prepaid envelope which is provided. Thank you for your assistance.

OFFICE USE
ONLY

44. WHAT IS THE SIZE OF YOUR FULL-TIME STAFF INCLUDING YOURSELF? (use full-time equivalents, i.e., 2 half-time staff members=1 full-time staff member) Check only one box in each of the three rows.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	None	1	2-3	4-6	7-9	10-14	15-19	20-29	30+
A. Professional	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
B. Clerical	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()
C. Student Assistants	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()	()

[65]
[66]
[67]

45. THE SIZE OF THE FINANCIAL AID STAFF IS ADEQUATE TO COPE WITH THE TASKS CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO US.

- | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| (1) Strongly agree | (4) Strongly disagree |
| (2) Moderately agree | (5) No opinion |
| (3) Moderately disagree | |

[68]

46. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF AID RECIPIENTS YOUR OFFICE HANDLED DIRECTLY IN 1976-77. (Include all recipients whether or not the FAO selects the recipient-e.g. state scholarships, BEOG's, etc.)

- | | |
|---------------|---------------|
| (0) 1-99 | (5) 1500-1999 |
| (1) 100-249 | (6) 2000-3999 |
| (2) 250-499 | (7) 4000-6999 |
| (3) 500-999 | (8) 7000-9999 |
| (4) 1000-1499 | (9) 10000+ |

[69]

47. PLEASE ESTIMATE THE AMOUNT OF AID DOLLARS ADMINISTERED BY YOUR OFFICE IN 1976-77. (Include all funds whether or not the FAO selects the recipient)

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (0) Under \$100,000 | (5) \$3,000,000-\$4,999,999 |
| (1) \$100,000-\$249,000 | (6) \$5,000,000-\$7,999,999 |
| (2) \$250,000-\$499,000 | (7) \$8,000,000-\$11,999,999 |
| (3) \$500,000-\$999,999 | (8) \$12,000,000-\$17,999,999 |
| (4) \$1,000,000-\$2,999,999 | (9) \$18,000,000 & over |

[70]

48. WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE FUNDS ADMINISTERED BY YOUR FINANCIAL AID OFFICE ARE ASSIGNED ON THE BASIS OF COMPUTED FINANCIAL NEED. (Include BEOG funds since their assignment involves a determination of relative family financial strength)

- | | |
|------------|---------------|
| (1) 100% | (6) 50-59% |
| (2) 90-99% | (7) 40-49% |
| (3) 80-89% | (8) 30-39% |
| (4) 70-79% | (9) Under 30% |
| (5) 60-69% | |

[71]

49. HAS YOUR OFFICE CONDUCTED ANY RESEARCH PROJECTS RELATING TO FINANCIAL AID TOPICS WITHIN THE PAST TWO YEARS?

- (1) YES (2) NO (If no, skip to question 51)

OFFICE USE
ONLY

[72]

1 2
YES NO

A. Were any of the research projects "analytical" (using tests of statistical significance)?

() ()

[73]

B Was assistance received from outside of the institution and/or from researchers who do not normally work for the the office?

() ()

[74]

C. Did any of your research projects deal with student attitudes toward either financing postsecondary education or financial aid programs

() ()

[75]

D. Did any of your research projects deal with the impact of financial aid programs, e.g. on student or institutional decision making?

() ()

[76]

50. HOW WERE THE RESULTS OF YOUR RESEARCH PROJECTS UTILIZED? (CHECK ALL WHICH APPLY)

- (1) For internal financial aid office operations & policy making
(2) For dissemination within selected offices or segments of the institution
(3) For publication in a professional journal

[77]

[78]

[79]

51. OFFICE RESPONSIBILITY FOR STUDENT EMPLOYMENT (Check the one best answer)

- (1) My office is responsible for both finding positions for College Work-Study (CWS) students and placing them in these positions.
(2) My office is responsible for finding positions for CWS students.
(3) My office is responsible for placing CWS students.
(4) My office is responsible for finding positions and/or placing students in positions for both the CWS program and other student employment program(s).
(5) My office has little or no responsibility for the student employment program.
(6) The institution does not have a student employment program
(7) Other (specify) _____

[80]

Important note: The National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators is in the process of developing a professional library of topics related to student financial aid. If your office has conducted any research projects recently, we would be interested in receiving copies. Similarly, if you are aware of recent master's theses, doctoral dissertations, or other papers at your institution relating to student financial aid, would you please forward copies of these to NASFAA or indicate how we can obtain copies:

National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators
910 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 228
Washington, D.C. 20006

Thank you for taking the time to read and complete this survey. The completed survey should be returned in the envelope which is provided.